

Coordinating Board for Higher Education

Agenda of Meeting

**8:00 AM
Thursday
December 4, 2003**

**Georgia Room
University Plaza Hotel
Springfield**

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Sandra D. Kauffman, Chair, Kansas City

Marie Carmichael, Vice Chair, Springfield

Mary Joan Wood, Secretary, Cairo

John F. Bass, St. Louis

Diana Bourisaw, St. Louis

Dudley R. Grove, St. Louis

Lowell C. Kruse, St. Joseph

Robert L. Langdon, Lexington

Kathryn F. Swan, Cape Girardeau

TIME: 8:00 AM
Thursday
December 4, 2003

PLACE: Georgia Room
University Plaza Hotel
Springfield

**Coordinating Board for Higher Education
Schedule of Events
University Plaza Hotel
Springfield, Missouri
December 3 and 4, 2003**

Wednesday, December 3

1:00 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.	CBHE Work Session Texas Room, University Plaza Hotel
-----------------------	---

Thursday, December 4

7:30 A.M. – 8:00 A.M.	Continental Breakfast for board, staff, presidents/chancellors Georgia Room, University Plaza Hotel
-----------------------	--

8:00 A.M. – 10:15 A.M.	CBHE Meeting Georgia Room, University Plaza Hotel
------------------------	--

10:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.	Missouri's Budget Outlook Linda Luebbering, State Budget Director Arizona Room, University Plaza Hotel
-------------------------	--

12:15 P.M. – 2:00 P.M.	2003 Governor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching Luncheon Nebraska and Iowa Rooms, University Plaza Hotel
------------------------	---

**CBHE Presidential Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
October 9, 2003
Dr. Evelyn Jorgenson, Presiding Chair**

The CBHE Presidential Advisory Committee met at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, October 9, 2003, in the Activity Center at Moberly Area Community College. Members (or their representatives) present were:

Marianne Inman (Central Methodist College)
Bobby Patton (Central Missouri State University)
Kent Farnsworth (Crowder College)
Karen Herzog (East Central College)
Henry Givens, Jr. (Harris-Stowe State College)
Joe Simmons for David Henson (Lincoln University)
William McKenna (Jefferson College)
Rick Mihalevich for Donald Claycomb (Linn State Technical College)
Edgar Rasch for Keith Lovin (Maryville University of St. Louis)
Wayne Giles and Don Doucette (Metropolitan Community Colleges)
Terry Barnes (Mineral Area College)
Julio Leon (Missouri Southern State University-Joplin)
Jeanie Crain for James Scanlon (Missouri Western State College)
Evelyn Jorgenson (Moberly Area Community College)
Walter Nolte (North Central Missouri College)
Dean Hubbard (Northwest Missouri State University)
Norman Myers (Ozarks Technical Community College)
Ken Dobbins (Southeast Missouri State University)
John Keiser (Southwest Missouri State University)
John McGuire (St. Charles Community College)
Marsha Drennon (State Fair Community College)
Mary Phyfer for John Cooper (Three Rivers Community College)
Barbara Dixon (Truman State University)
Richard Wallace (University of Missouri-Columbia)
Y. T. Shah for Gary Thomas (University of Missouri-Rolla)
Thomas George (University of Missouri-St. Louis)

Members absent from the meeting were:

Helen Washburn (Cottey College)
William L. Fox (Culver-Stockton College)
Henry Shannon (St. Louis Community College)
Elson Floyd (University of Missouri)
Martha Gilliland (University of Missouri-Kansas City)
Mark S. Wrighton (Washington University)

Members of the Coordinating Board present were:

Sandra Kauffman, Chair
Lowell Kruse, Vice Chair
Dudley Grove, Secretary
Diana Bourisaw
Robert Langdon
Kathryn Swan
Mary Joan Wood

Also attending were:

Trudy Baker, Administrative Assistant for EPPIC
Becky Brennecke, Research Associate
Debra Cheshier, Director of Educational Policy, Planning, and Improvement Center (EPPIC)
Scott Giles, Director, Missouri Student Loan Group
Donna Imhoff, Budget Analyst
Joe Martin, Deputy Commissioner
Jim Matchefts, Assistant Commissioner and General Counsel
Susanne Medley, Director, Communications and Customer Assistance
Brenda Miner, Executive Assistant to the Commissioner
Dan Peterson, Director, Financial Assistance and Outreach Group
Renee Riley, Public Information Specialist
Cleo Samudzi, Senior Associate
Greg Sandbothe, Office Services Assistant
Robert Stein, Associate Commissioner, Academic Affairs
Laura Vedenhaupt, Administrative Assistant for Academic Affairs
Quentin Wilson, Commissioner of Higher Education
John Wittstruck, Senior Research Associate (EPPIC)

Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Evelyn Jorgenson, president, Moberly Area Community College (MACC), welcomed the presidents and chancellors to the campus and to Moberly, stating that MACC was happy to host the Coordinating Board for Higher Education meeting. With the absence of Dr. Henry Shannon and no vice chair present, Dr. Jorgenson agreed to preside as chair of the meeting.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education, Chair Sandra Kauffman introduced new leaders of three institutions and welcomed them to the Presidential Advisory Committee: Dr. Thomas George, chancellor, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Dr. Barbara Dixon, president, Truman State University, and Dr. Marsha Drennon, president, State Fair Community College.

Missouri Campus Compact

Dr. John T. Strong, executive director, Missouri Campus Compact, reported on the progress of the Campus Compact in its endeavors to elevate and support civic engagement and citizenship development at Missouri's institutions of higher learning. The Missouri Campus Compact is an

asset during this time of opportunity for Missouri to achieve its goals and priorities for higher education.

Many presidents and chancellors are affirming the importance of higher education's role in citizenship development. The Missouri Campus Compact will promote conversations among Missouri's institutions of higher learning in academic year 2004 through the following activities:

- The compact will conduct trainings to teach students how to organize and facilitate conversations on important topics, including and recognizing diverse participants.
- On Thursday, February 12, 2004, a statewide dialogue, a part of and funded by Raise Your Voice campaign, will be held in Jefferson City. Last year, 120 students from 13 member institutions attended.
- Missouri played an important role in developing a national videoconference, to be held on Thursday, February 19, 2004, originating from the campus of Michigan State University and broadcast, via satellite, to Missouri's campuses and on the web. The videoconference will involve a discussion of *The New Student Politics*. No cost is involved for participation.
- Month of Action grants will be distributed in February and March 2004, for community service projects. All current members of Missouri Campus Compact qualify for this grant. Requests for proposals for these awards will be distributed in late October 2003. Applications were sent to member schools and are available on the web at <http://missouricompact.SMSU.edu>
- There will be a one-day student conference on Saturday, February 28, 2004, summarizing two years of the Raise Your Voice campaign in the St. Louis area. Students of participating institutions are encouraged to attend this conference.

Of the 28 member institutions of the Missouri Campus Compact, there are 10 two-year college campuses. Staff and faculty of the community colleges have provided strong support in organizing the Raise Your Voice campaign. The national reorganization of the Campus Compact office will strengthen the services offered to the two-year campuses. Dr. Steve Jones, who previously taught political science at a community college, is the interim director of the Division of Services to two-year colleges. Dr. Bob Franco, Kap'olani of the Community College in Hawaii, is the compact's National Engaged Scholar for two-year campuses during 2004. He will be sponsored, in conjunction with the Illinois Campus Compact, at a conference this winter. The Missouri Campus Compact maintains connections with the Community College National Center for Community Engagement located at Maricopa Community College in Arizona.

The Missouri Campus Compact has an important role in helping service-learning directors and practitioners throughout the state network. The compact's web site and database, being updated recently and the scheduled network meeting on Tuesday, October 14 at the Truman State Office Building in Jefferson City, will be beneficial in the attainment of this goal. Dr. Strong encouraged the presidents and chancellors to ask the service-learning directors on their campuses to attend this meeting.

The Missouri Campus Compact supports the Midwest Collaboration consisting of campus compacts of Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The Raise Your Voice campaign and the videoconference are two products of the collaboration among these member states, as is the Midwest Collaboration's regional conference of executive directors at the host campus, Southwest Missouri State University, on June 2-4, 2004.

Dr. Strong expressed his gratitude for the leadership of Missouri's executive committee: Dr. Lynn Suydam, St. Louis Community College-Meramec; Dr. Marianne Inman, Central Methodist College; and Dr. John Keiser, Southwest Missouri State University.

Performance Excellence Funding

Dr. Robert Stein presented background information about Missouri's involvement with performance funding, which dates back to 1989 when the board directed its staff to explore the concept of performance funding with all public sector institutions. There was general consensus throughout the legislative and executive branches of Missouri's government as well as with business and education leaders that performance funding mechanisms should be utilized to the extent feasible. The board's first formal recommendation for performance funding was with the FY 1993 budget request demonstrating higher education's commitment to be held responsible for results. Missouri's Funding for Results program continued until the last few years when tight fiscal times placed performance funding on a back burner.

In the past, funding for results was the most popular type of funding for institutions as it provided flexibility and control. Mr. Joe Martin stated that approximately \$150 million in funding was core cut from the higher education budget in FY 2003 and FY 2004. Higher education will request the restoration of the \$25 million withholding suffered in FY 2004, but it has not been determined how this will be accomplished to ensure enhanced funding in future years.

Performance funding and quality results are in the forefront with the passage of SB 299, which requires performance-based budgeting. The House of Representatives appointed appropriation sub-committees to examine performance and results attained by various state entities, including higher education.. Additional funding will be difficult to obtain and higher education will be asked to demonstrate the necessity of their requests. A demonstration of performance funding based on quality initiatives, tied into the current fiscal situation, will provide stronger support for the retrieval of the funding.

Dr. John Keiser, president, Southwest Missouri State University, speaking on behalf of the presidents and chancellors, suggested that the state should spend more than its current five percent on higher education. According to Dr. Keiser, every institution exhibits an abundance of quality and state funding is used for quality initiatives and programs. There is an opportunity for the higher education community to utilize the six priority issues identified by the Commission on the Future of Higher Education by emphasizing and focusing on their importance and working with the Coordinating Board for Higher Education to influence the legislature.

Dr. Richard Wallace, chancellor, University of Missouri-Columbia, stated that at the state and system levels, there needs to be an allocation of resources available, within the context of the institutions' missions, to accomplish their work efficiently, while ensuring quality. According to

Dr. Wallace, it is necessary to demonstrate more effectively to the state that institutions are accomplishing this. Focusing only on six priorities is not sufficient as it fails to reflect some of the important aspects of the mission of the University of Missouri, specifically research and development. The priorities do not capture all the issues completely and appropriately. The underlying fundamental ideas supporting the six priorities are valid and acceptable, but higher education must ensure that the incentives and allocations are in accord with the missions of the institutions. A heavier focus must be placed on those common responsibilities of the institutions and those they share as a group.

Dr. John McGuire, president, St. Charles County Community College, offered the community colleges' support for development of a performance excellence piece of the budget request.

The presidents and chancellors offered other thoughts and suggestions as follows:

- A core figure, i.e. \$25 million, that represents a more realistic percentage of funding for results, should be identified.
- Resource allocation affects all institutions.
- Those serving on the Commission on the Future of Higher Education should adjust the six priorities.
- The institutions need to agree on an approach to funding.
- The amount of funding the state receives for each student should be determined.
- Taxpayers will expect higher education to accomplish everything suggested by the Commission on the Future of Higher Education.
- Higher education should demonstrate the benefits of a performance-based budget fund by identifying results achieved with various percentages of the funding.
- Inform the legislature of achievements of the higher education community.
- Demonstrate cost effectiveness and efficiency measures adopted by the institutions, and how those measures determine the projects of each institution.
- Explain the qualities of each institution, by individual campuses.

Mr. Robert Langdon stated that higher education needs to justify the economic benefits of funding and its benefit to the state in order to retrieve the dollars higher education lost, eliminating the transfer of the problem to the institutions and to the families with students attending those institutions. According to Mr. Langdon, Missouri values economic development and the legislature needs to be informed that higher education will produce the workers necessary to fill future jobs.

In addition, while it is difficult to believe that higher education can retrieve lost funding, with the support of all the institutions as a group, higher education can demonstrate its accomplishments. There needs to be agreement and clarification in the higher education community regarding the strategy behind the system's accomplishments, how the initiatives were achieved, and the purpose for which they were intended.

Dr. John McGuire, president, St. Charles County Community College, offered the community colleges' support for development of a performance excellence piece of the budget request..

Mrs. Dudley Grove offered that the six priorities are not tailored to individual institutional needs, but rather to the state's needs and the higher education community's need to achieve what the state requires. She suggested higher education must:

- Adequately respond to the state's needs;
- Examine and concentrate on the six priorities;
- Produce quality students; and
- Operate differently than in the past.

Dr. Diana Bourisaw stated that the unity of a single collective voice has power. K-12 has power because of their unified purpose. Higher education institutions need to speak with a unified voice. Diversity in institutional mission is good and necessary, but institutional goals and purpose are the same.

Dr. Wallace stated that from the perspective of what is best for the state of Missouri, there is validity to:

- Educating more students;
- Measurement by increments;
- Research; and
- Enrichment of lives.

Commissioner Wilson committed that by December, the department, in consultation with representatives from the two-year and four-year sectors, will seek a resolution to the following issues:

- Development of a funding level for performance excellence funding initiative either at the margins (e.g. \$4 million) or on a larger scale (\$25 million)
- Development of a set of results higher education seeks to focus on and achieve with performance excellence funding.

Dr. Jorgenson summarized by stating that the presidents and chancellors will look to Commissioner Wilson for guidance on how the institutions can come together and become stronger under this plan.

Higher Education FY 2005 Budget

Mr. Martin stated that state revenues were on target thus far in FY 2004, and that hopefully there will be no additional withholdings in the current fiscal year. He presented recommendations stating that the amount recommended for each institution is the FY 2004 core appropriation amount. The amounts may include a component of Performance Excellence Funding based on the recommendations contained in Tab A. The recommended core appropriation amounts for institutions are:

- Public Four-year Institution Operating Appropriations \$697,250,724
Tax Refund Offset Core Appropriation \$ 875,000
- Linn State Technical College Operating Appropriations \$4,433,887
Tax Refund Offset Core Appropriation \$30,000
- Public Community College Operating Appropriations \$130,021,553
Tax Refund Offset Core Appropriation \$250,000

Mr. Martin stated that the Department of Higher Education's core operating appropriations request for FY 2005 have been reduced by \$3,746,546 and 5 FTE.

Associate Degree Delivery Mission Differentiation

Dr. Stein indicated that the Department of Higher Education staff is committed to moving away from an overly regulatory environment to one that fosters performance excellence by emphasizing quality principles. Interest in associate degree delivery and mission differentiation has resulted in extensive dialogue throughout the academic community. Based on institutional comments to the agenda item on Associate Degree Delivery Mission Differentiation behind Tab K, the Department of Higher Education staff determined that it should not be formally presented at the board meeting. This will provide staff with additional time to work with institutional representatives in ensuring greater consensus concerning a public policy environment for increasing access to lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates and associate degrees.

Chair Kauffman extended the board's deep appreciation to presidents and chancellors for their hard work in developing a recommended draft agreement on this issue. She indicated the board's understanding of the extensive time expended and the leadership and dedication of the COPHE/MCCA subcommittee in addressing obstacles and reaching compromises that are included in the current draft agreement. Chair Kauffman instructed staff to work with the COPHE/MCCA subcommittee in exploring further issues associated with improving access and developing further detail about the recommendation that will be presented to the board for action. Dr. Stein pledged his support to work with all institutions in identifying areas of consensus and areas of disagreement for presentation to the board at its December 2003 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

TIME: 8:00 AM
Thursday
December 4, 2003

PLACE: Georgia Room
University Plaza Hotel
Springfield

AGENDA

	<u>Tab</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Discussion Item</u>
I. Minutes of the October 9, 2003 CBHE Meeting		*	
II. Minutes of the November 4, 2003 CBHE Conference Call		*	
III. Report of the Commissioner			
IV. Lake of the Ozarks Community College Proposal (Ratification of Conference Call Vote)	A	*	
V. Proposed 2005 CBHE Meeting Dates and Locations	B	*	
VI. Adjustments to the FY 2005 Budget Recommendations			
Revised Capital Improvement Recommendation	C	*	
Performance Excellence Funding	D	*	
VII. Proposed Public Policy Guidelines for Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery	E	*	
VIII. Information Items			
Distribution of Community College Funds	1		
Proprietary School Certification Actions and Reviews	2		
Appointments to the CBHE Proprietary School Advisory Committee	3		
Academic Program Actions	4		

Executive Session

RSMo 610.021(1) relating to "legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys."

RSMo 610.021(3) relating to "hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded."

Other matters that may be discussed in closed meetings, as set forth in RSMo 610.021.

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Minutes of Meeting
October 9, 2003

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education met at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 9, 2003 at the Andrew Komar, Jr. Hall at Moberly Area Community College in Moberly. Members present were:

Sandra Kauffman, Chair
Lowell Kruse, Vice Chair
Dudley Grove, Secretary
Diana Bourisaw
Robert Langdon
Kathryn Swan
Mary Joan Wood

Members absent from the meeting were:

John Bass
Marie Carmichael

Others attending included:

Trudy Baker, Administrative Assistant (EPPIC)
Becky Brennecke, Research Associate
Debra Cheshier, Director of Educational Policy, Planning, and Improvement Center (EPPIC)
Scott Giles, Director, Missouri Student Loan Group
Donna Imhoff, Budget Analyst
Joe Martin, Deputy Commissioner
Jim Matchefts, Assistant Commissioner and General Counsel
Brenda Miner, Executive Assistant to the Commissioner
Susanne Medley, Director, Communications and Customer Assistance
Dan Peterson, Director, Financial Assistance and Outreach Group
Renee Riley, Public Information Specialist
Cleo Samudzi, Senior Associate
Greg Sandbothe, Office Services Assistant
Robert Stein, Associate Commissioner, Academic Affairs
Laura Vedenhaupt, Administrative Assistant, Academic Affairs
Quentin Wilson, Commissioner of Higher Education
John Wittstruck, Senior Research Associate (EPPIC)

Chair Kauffman called the meeting to order. A list of guests attending the meeting is included as Attachment A

Minutes of June 5, 2003 CBHE Meeting

Mrs. Grove referenced a typographical error in the minutes and moved **that the minutes of the June 5, 2003 board meeting be approved as corrected.** Dr. Diana Bourisaw seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Chair Kauffman recognized Dr. John Coffman, former member of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education; Dr. Thomas George, Chancellor, University of Missouri-St. Louis; Dr. Barbara Dixon, President, Truman State University; and Dr. Marsha Drennon, President, State Fair Community College.

Commissioner's Report

Commissioner Wilson reported that new information from Linda Luebbering, State Budget Director, indicates that there is hope for the first time in two years concerning state revenues. The current FY 2004 budget was based on a projection of revenue increases of about 4.4 percent. However, through the first quarter of this fiscal year, revenues were 3.2 percent higher, enough to prevent additional withholdings. The Office of Budget and Planning will make a projection of the official revenue estimate for FY 2004 and FY 2005 in December and evaluate the situation at that time.

While there are no further withholdings expected, there is no expectation for the return of the withholdings that higher education sustained. The Commissioner and Mr. Joe Martin visited with the governor's office to request the return of those withholdings. Historically, the economy has grown at the national level, in presidential election years; however, it is uncertain what more the federal government can do due to low interest rates and the size of the federal deficit. The legislature is not expected to support any type of revenue enhancements to meet the needs of the state.

It is important for higher education to monitor the funding for tax reform, modernizing the tax system, or a flat-tax system that could impact revenue. The court case for K-12 is another consideration in the financial projections that needs to be monitored for the possible role higher education could play as it is based on equity funding. The court's decision could provide more funding for K-12, but leave less available for other needs which constitute the largest percentage of the general revenue budget.

Results and performance in higher education are receiving considerable attention, perhaps as a result of the present financial conditions. The Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopted the quality criteria and priority results in April 2003. The Commission on the Future of Higher Education, created by the governor, is focused on priority results. The Business Education Roundtable presented goals that reflected their views on priority outcomes for education. The Department of Higher Education and the Missouri Training and Employment Council are also analyzing and prioritizing results. The legislature is trying to develop this kind of approach to guarantee that higher education achieves prioritized results, while not specifying what results are required. There is much interest, but not yet a consensus on the most important priority results.

Most higher education results discussed with institutional leaders are connected to:

- Preparation – training quality teachers and/or providing the core curriculum for more students;
- Early awareness and outreach - with greater participation by underrepresented groups;
- Participation – the actual successful participation in higher education with more students completing degree programs;
- Economic impact – meeting workforce needs and stimulating individuals to obtain better jobs and spur economic growth; and
- Performance excellence – continuous improvement in terms of quality, managing for results, performance-based budgeting, and accountability.

Other common goals are teacher quality, financial aid, increased learning, and participation in quality-based improvement efforts. Another common theme is collaboration between education agencies and economic development. Higher education needs to work with K-12, the Department of Economic Development, economic developers, the business community, and other higher education entities such as MOHELA.

The message received by Commissioner Wilson in conversation with the legislative director for Congressman McKean is that the federal government is focused on cost control and graduation rates. Commissioner Wilson, along with other higher education leaders across the country, realizes that achievement of those two issues would result in a sacrifice of quality. The legislative director considers it legitimate for the federal government to expect performance from its invested dollars, a position that differs among other state higher education executive officers.

The Department of Higher Education had about \$700 million, including consolidations, in guarantees in their student loan program last year. This is about equal to the amount invested by the state in all four-year institutions, meaning more money is loaned than is provided for support. The volume of loans is increasing while the support for higher education is decreasing.

The self-assessment that the department has initiated is the result of a shift toward a more customer-based approach, more communication with employees, and more communication within the system of higher education. Improvement is evident in those areas on which the department has focused, while other areas have not changed due to undetermined priorities and anticipated input.

These are surrogate measures for some criteria included in the Baldrige Award and other processes of valuing employees and developing processes for improvement. In six months, there will be a financial self-assessment using the Baldrige process and possibly the Missouri Quality Award criteria to report to the board on the department's progress, providing a role for the board in the evaluation process. In addition, to this the board has received the 360° evaluation for the Commissioner.

A list of institutional efficiencies has been presented to the legislature, describing the improvements in performance initiated and achieved by the institutions. Increased workloads have caused an administrative burden for many of the schools.

The process in which the department is handling administrative expenses in spite of their reduced budget will be discussed with the budget agenda item. The FY 2004 improvement projects, in relation to the strategic planning efforts, have been selected and are based heavily on financial aid. They include improving the student loan program, the grant program, early awareness and outreach to inform more citizens about the aid available to them, as well as the quality initiatives, measuring learning, and encouraging more institutions to engage in quality initiatives. By the end of October, staff will be chartering these projects.

Many staff have supported administratively and assisted with meeting arrangements of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education. Reports conveying the best practices in other states in the areas of participation, preparation, and performance among the fifty states, provided the Commission with a broad range of policy options for their selection in performing their work. A copy of that report, as well as an expanded version, will be made available to presidents and chancellors at a later date.

The department is also promoting the quality process. Two informational workshops were held in September that focused on two quality initiatives - AQIP and Missouri Quality Award, in which representatives of nearly every public institution and many independent colleges attended. With the board's directive to involve more institutions, with the inclusion of Missouri Western joining AQIP, the department has increased participation of the institutions by 33 percent.

Institutions presently involved in some form of official quality programs are: Northwest Missouri State University, University of Missouri-Rolla, Crowder College, and Missouri Western State College. It is anticipated that the institutions will share plans for their quality programs with the department. The value, in terms of results and measures, is the documentation of the achievements already made, along with improvements that will ensue.

Promoting self-assessment is a good strategy for all institutions; whether or not they participate in a total quality program. With participation by all institutions, obvious knowledge of their stance on the categories for improvement would be available. Participation provides a system whereby institutions can aggregate their information in a manner that will ensure comprehension by the legislature. It is vital for institutions to be involved in some form of quality initiative or measurement of their achievements in strategic planning against quality. The institutions are ready to initiate this as was evident in their participation at the AQIP sessions. It is not expected that all institutions pursue the Missouri Quality Award or join AQIP, but they need to evaluate their achievements because strong, robust plans are developing statewide.

Missouri is a national leader in institutions measuring learning at the exit level, but there is the issue of value-added learning and how that information is used to improve programs. The department is pursuing this and developing a project that will involve higher education officials. The performance excellence funding proposal, driven somewhat by Dr. William Massey's work, brings together all policy issues regarding quality and suggests that a small increment can have a large impact on quality.

Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee

Dr. Evelyn Jorgenson, president, Moberly Area Community College, reported on items that were discussed at the Presidential Advisory Meeting.

- Missouri Campus Compact update, delivered by John Strong, described how the Raise Your Voice Campaign has contributed successfully toward increasing the awareness that students can make a difference. Southwest Missouri State University will host a conference in June 2004. Membership of Missouri's institutions is increasing in the Campus Compact, a nationwide process involving two-year and four-year institutions.
- Commissioner Wilson, Mr. Joe Martin, and Dr. Robert Stein reported on performance excellence funding. It was noted that the legislature is committed to prioritization of results. Steps should be taken to set a common agenda, provide evidence of excellence, and determine a way to demonstrate to the legislature and other stakeholders that progress, worthy of funding, is taking place.

Historical information revealed that Funding for Results was in existence for several years in the 1990s and present discussions on performance excellence funding evolved from the traditional processes of that type. There is a desire to learn from past experiences regarding what worked and what did not work in order to develop new performance excellence funding processes.

There is the possibility of a return to base-level funding, with an emphasis on performance and quality. There is some disagreement on how progress will be demonstrated and what criteria will be used to measure performance excellence. The six priority measures identified for the state should be part of the process but, being open to many interpretations, require more work to identify the process and priority outcomes for the two-year and four-year institutions. Commissioner Wilson noted that initially the process should be identified and agreed upon by the institutions that should then work together to develop the language of a common message that can be delivered to legislators and citizens of the state.

- Commissioner Wilson and Mr. Martin reported on the FY 2005 higher education budget, which basically is the amount requested in FY 2004, in hopes that higher education can manage next year as well as it did last year, in spite of the reported possible shortfall of \$900 million projected for FY 2005.
- Associate degree delivery mission differentiation was discussed. Chair Kauffman expressed an appreciation for all the work that has been devoted to it. The committee of two-year and four-year institutions has had long discussions and identified some important differentiations between the roles of associate degree-granting institutions and four-year institutions. The committee will abide by the board's suggestion that additional work is necessary, and with the board's direction, the committee will deliver this item to the board at the December 4, 2003 Coordinating Board for Higher Education meeting. Chair Kauffman directed the committee to work toward greater access with an emphasis on quality of principles.

Higher Education FY 2005 Budget

Dr. Stein stated that there is agreement nationwide and in Missouri specifically that funding policies should be integrated with planning, assessment for improving accountability, and state priorities linked with funding.

Over a decade ago, Funding for Results was accomplished with a consensus-building approach. The Department of Higher Education staff strongly believes that higher education should embark on a performance excellence initiative that is built on lessons learned from previous mistakes. Dr. Stein emphasized the following:

- What is initiated should be linked with state goals.
- Institutions missions and baseline data should be major drivers.
- Realistic goals and stretch targets should be utilized.
- Procedures should allow for flexibility and programs customized to specific institutions.
- Time is required in order to demonstrate results.
- Demonstrating results is dependent upon the institutions' efforts to begin the initiative and to remain serious and consistent in their endeavors.
- The messages used are extremely important in the communication that transpires between constituents within the higher education community and its external constituents.

Mr. Martin stated that, as higher education moves forward with Performance Excellence Funding, in the context of the budget and the current financial situation of the state, there is an awareness that there are finite funding resources available to meet the state's needs. The competition for those finite resources will become keener as K-12 education, mental health, social services, and the corrections system also seek to utilize those resources. To put higher education in a favorable position to compete for the return of sufficient levels of funding, higher education will need to demonstrate its worth to the General Assembly and to the public. Higher education will need to convince the public that investment in higher education is a good investment by the state and by the taxpayers. The mechanism used will need to demonstrate higher education's commitment to quality, performance results, and performance measures that will demonstrate the advantage of higher education to the public good and provide further reasons for investing in it.

Mr. Kruse expressed an interest in knowing what lies ahead if measuring results and Performance Excellence Funding progressed as higher education envisions. Dr. Stein stated that:

- The funding recommendations under this initiative would provide incentives for performance excellence.

- The reports to the board would be affected by the initiative as it relates to the six priorities of the state, providing data, verifying achievements, reporting progress, and placing higher education in a position where it can publicly communicate more effectively.

The community colleges have appointed an indicators group, chaired by Dr. John McGuire to work on the processes. Similarly, the department needs to work jointly with the four-year institutions to arrive at common indicators. Commonalities exist between both sectors that are measurable.

Mr. Martin explained that submission of a budget request to the governor would occur as soon as possible after this meeting, and if this particular agenda item is adopted, the governor's office would be notified that in December, the department may have additional information for consideration for the governor's executive budget which is presented to the General Assembly in January.

Dr. Stein stated **that it is recommended that the Coordinating Board acknowledge that performance-based budgeting is a viable and desirable strategy to promote quality and performance excellence.**

It is further recommended that the Board direct the Commissioner to discuss options with higher education leaders, legislators, and the executive branch to develop a new Performance Excellence Funding Initiative that would begin with the FY 2005 appropriation. A staff recommendation concerning the amount of Performance Excellence Funding to be included as an addendum to the Board's FY 2005 budget request should be presented at the CBHE's December 4, 2003 meeting. In addition, recommendations concerning a proposed set of criteria and processes for distribution of Performance Excellence Funding should be developed for review and comment.

Dr. Bourisaw moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Grove seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mrs. Wood stated that in the past, Funding for Results was very effective in motivating and promoting change within institutions. Mrs. Wood has confidence in the Performance Excellence Funding concept and encouraged everyone to support it.

Recommendations for Public Four-year Institution Operating Appropriations

Mr. Martin stated that the recommendation for FY 2005 is the core budget for FY 2004, and may contain a performance excellence funding component. The only change in the University of Missouri core appropriation recommendations is the combined appropriation for Ellis Fischel Cancer Center with the Hospitals and Clinics, in accordance with the University of Missouri's request.

Chair Kauffman stated that it is important to keep members of the General Assembly informed of higher education's real needs, if not presented in a budget that is greater than the previous year, by making them aware of the institutions' requests and the targets of those requests.

Mr. Martin said **it is recommended the Board approve the FY 2005 four-year institution appropriation request including University of Missouri Related Programs, as presented, for submission to the governor and General Assembly.**

Mrs. Wood moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Swan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Recommendations for Linn State Technical College Operating Appropriations

Mr. Martin stated that the FY 2005 amount is the recommended amount of the FY 2004 core appropriation, and may include a performance excellence funding component. Mr. Martin said **it is recommended the Board approve the FY 2005 Linn State Technical College appropriation request, as presented, for submission to the governor and General Assembly.**

Mr. Langdon moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Swan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Recommendations for Public Community College Operating Appropriations

Mr. Martin stated that the FY 2005 recommendation is the FY 2004 core budget request and may include a performance excellence funding component. Mr. Martin said **it is recommended the Board approve the FY 2005 community college appropriation request, as presented, for submission to the governor and the General Assembly.**

Mrs. Swan moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Grove seconded the motion, as it passed unanimously.

Recommendations for DHE Operating Appropriations

Mr. Martin stated that most of the items are FY 2004 core requests, with the difference being the removal of a specific line-item appropriation for the Missouri Learners' Network, which higher education will continue operating without a line-item appropriation. In the Financial Assistance and Outreach Group, there has been a retirement in staff, reducing the GEAR-UP Early Awareness and Outreach Program by one FTE. In the Student Loan Program Administration, there is a reduction of 2.5 FTE and \$823,154. In E-government Administration there was a reduction of 1.5 FTE and \$53,592. In total, the loan and federal FTE authority was reduced by 5 FTE and approximately \$3.7 million. This demonstrates efforts to reorganize, streamline, and consolidate the department to reflect a more accurate picture of the higher education agency and its present operation.

Mr. Martin stated **that it is recommended the Board approve the CBHE FY 2005 internal appropriation request, as presented, for submission to the governor and General Assembly.**

Mrs. Grove moved to adopt the motion. Dr. Bourisaw seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Recommendations for State Student Financial Assistance Programs

Mr. Martin stated that there are seven state grant and scholarship programs. The recommended amount is the same as the FY 2004 recommendation with the exception of the Advantage Missouri Program, which is being phased out. This will result in a reduction of about \$400,000 because only renewal scholarships will be issued.

Mr. Martin said **it is recommended the Board approve the CBHE FY 2005 Student Financial Assistance appropriation request, as presented, for submission to the governor and General Assembly.**

Mrs. Wood moved to adopt the motion. Mr. Langdon seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Recommendations for Public Four-year Institutions and Linn State Technical College's Capital Improvements

Mr. Martin stated that the FY 2005 Capital Improvement request totals just over \$207 million and includes 14 projects. The priority ranking reflects the same ranking submitted in FY 2004, with the exception of the University of Missouri-Columbia and the University of Missouri-Kansas City, who received appropriations for their previous priorities. In FY 2004 the University of Missouri-Columbia received a reappropriation of nearly \$29 million for the life sciences building, and the University of Missouri-Kansas City was appropriated \$30.5 million for the pharmacy and nursing (life sciences) building. The other projects are the same as those requested in FY 2004, with the amounts revised to reflect increasing construction costs.

Mr. Martin said **it is recommended the Board approve the FY 2005 capital improvement recommendations for the public four-year institutions and Linn State Technical College for submission to the governor and General Assembly.**

Dr. Bourisaw moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Swan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Kruse commended the presidents and chancellors, the institutions' staffs, and the staff at the Department of Higher Education for their impressive efforts and accomplishments given the financial issues that continue to face higher education.

Promoting Quality and Performance Excellence: An Update on DHE's Strategic Planning

Commissioner Wilson discussed the importance state government places on strategic planning. Within the department, Dr. Debra Cheshier, director of the Educational Policy, Planning, and Improvement Center (EPPIC), discussed the draft of the department's strategic plan. It involves the five areas the Coordinating Board selected as having the greatest potential impact on the future of higher education in Missouri. The areas may change somewhat from year to year, but essentially reflect long-term goals. Six improvement projects based on these strategic areas have been selected on which to focus in FY 2004.

Dr. Cheshier stated that by the end of October, teams would be selected and their missions chartered for the six improvement projects, which will form the focus of the department's

strategic planning efforts. Measures to be reported on a quarterly basis are being identified and will be monitored regularly to determine the progress made in these areas.

Mrs. Grove indicated support for the five priority areas. The interest of the Coordinating Board and the department in life sciences and research is evident by the efforts being made to improve workforce and economic conditions in Missouri, signifying that it is a priority that should be added to this list in the future. Dr. Cheshier stated that the department is involved with other projects, in addition to those identified in the draft strategic plan. The Research Alliance of Missouri is an example of an interdepartmental initiative specifically aimed at promoting life sciences research.

Over the next several months, EPPIC staff will be assembling baseline data and benchmarks for each of the priority results outlined in the draft strategic plan. If data for specific baseline measures are unavailable, staff will make recommendations about alternative or proxy measures.

Lake of the Ozarks Community College Proposal

Dr. John Wittstruck reported that the Department of Higher Education staff analysis associated with the proposal to establish a new community college taxing district in the Lake of the Ozarks region of the state, has determined the proposal meets with the Board's standards as revised in the administrative rule. It is estimated that the district will have local income in excess of \$850,000 to what may be necessary to finance the community college. Dr. Wittstruck introduced two members of the Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee, Chair Nickie Foster and William Culver.

On October 30, 2003, the administrative rule becomes a formal administrative rule. This agenda item is a presentation of the recommendation for the board to call an election within the public school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II on the question of establishing a new community college district at the Lake of the Ozarks.

The recommendation is to be considered by the Coordinating Board during a conference call meeting of the board at 7:30 a.m. on November 4, 2003.

Dr. Wittstruck stated **that it is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education order, as authorized in section 178.800, RSMo, the submission of the following question within the public school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II to vote on the question and to elect trustees at the next following annual municipal election:**

Shall there be organized within the area comprising the school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II, state of Missouri, a junior college district for the offering of 13th and 14th year courses, to be known as the "Junior College District of Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri," having the power to impose a property tax not to exceed the annual rate of twenty cents on the one hundred dollars assessed valuation of taxable property without voter approval and such additional taxes as may be approved by vote thereon, as prayed in petition filed with the Coordinating Board for Higher Education at Jefferson City, Missouri, on the Eighth day of September 2003?

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education authorize the Commissioner of Higher Education to take all necessary action for calling the election.

The board took no action on the item, rather tabling the action until the conference call on November 4, 2003.

Chair Kauffman thanked Dr. Wittstruck, and expressed the board's appreciation to Chair Nickie Foster and William Culver for attending the meeting, and for their patience with the process, wishing them well in their endeavors.

PreK-16 Initiatives-Business Education Roundtable Recommendations

Dr. Robert Stein provided background information on the Business Education Roundtable (BERT) that was established by the governor in 2002 with a 40-person panel. Five members represent higher education, with Mrs. Swan being a member before she was appointed to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. In the span of 16 months, there have been meetings, discussions, and dialogue. The group formed three sub-committees: Teachers as Professionals, Improving School Environment, and Funding Issues. In July 2003, a report with 28 recommendations was issued in which several recommendations identified the Coordinating Board and the Department of Higher Education as the responsible entity with target dates to achieve various tasks.

Missouri became interested in the PreK-16 initiative in 1997. Since then, there has been an abundance of good recommendations and many reports. The Coordinating Board is committed to PreK-16 issues, to teacher quality issues, and to higher education's interdependence. The department staff recommends that the institutions have time to discuss PreK-16 to determine appropriate next steps.

Dr. Stein stated that it is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education formally receive the Business Education Roundtable Report and express its sincere gratitude to Governor Holden for establishing the Roundtable and to Roundtable members for their insightful recommendations.

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education hold a special work session sometime prior to its meeting to review in detail the BERT recommendations, to prioritize its PreK-16 work, and to determine next steps.

Mrs. Grove moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Swan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Kruse asked why PreK-16 had not advanced and if the differences delaying it were included in this report. Dr. Stein stated that it is difficult to keep an agenda moving within the culture with so much decentralization without formal agreement on how PreK-16 should advance. There have been many good statements and ideal suggestions for ways to improve. The disagreements concern how and in what way higher education proceeds to have a greater impact. Beneath the recommendations included in this report are implications about K-12 funding: How and in what manner these issues develop will have implications for higher education funding and potential disagreements between the two sectors.

Mr. Kruse, speaking from his perspective as chairman of two local initiatives, the Success By Six Initiative and the Chamber of Commerce Workforce Development, supports the PreK-16 initiative and how it relates to workforce development, but realizes there is something preventing people from agreement.

Dr. Stein stated that some achievements are occurring in PreK-16. One key example is completion of core curriculum for a select group – students proceeding to four-year institutions - from 46 percent to above 90 percent. This tremendous progress was possible because K-12 and higher education were committed to it. With the arrival of *Measuring Up*, however, came the realization that the wrong denominator was used. Tracking high schools graduates, emphasis is now on all ninth graders.

During a visit with Education Commissioner Kent King, Commissioner Wilson and Dr. Stein presented many possible agendas and issues that are of common interest to both boards. Several items were identified, including: the core curriculum, advanced credit programs in high schools, and the role of community colleges, especially in teacher education.

This agenda item identifies which BERT recommendations specifically identified the Coordinating Board for Higher Education or the department staff. This agenda item does not intend to suggest the Coordinating Board focus only on these suggested recommendations, but provides a quick summary of the recommendations that pertain to higher education.

Historically, the two boards met annually. One recommendation suggests that they meet immediately to discuss the alignment of the curriculum in the junior and senior years of high school as well as college, including the assessments that occur. It is important, prior to this meeting, that the Coordinating Board had a fully intensive, in-depth discussion of the priorities forming their work in preK-16.

One issue that is under consideration is the involvement of K-12 in the Coordinating Board for Higher Education Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA).

Another issue that has been raised involves K-16 formal structures. In Missouri, a board does not govern PreK-16, but other states have governing models that integrate K-12 and PreK-16:

- A commissioner of higher education might participate on the K-12 board with the K-12 commissioner participating on the higher education board.
- A group may be appointed with responsibility for PreK-16 work.

Mrs. Grove stated much work has been devoted to PreK-16 and although there are many recommendations, it is an opportunity for higher education to select two top recommendations to include on their agenda this year, repeating the selection in following years.

The challenge to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, as a partner of PreK-16 is to decide on an initiative in this area and using the quality principles to determine goals, tracking, measurements, and baseline data. Achievements that higher education can attain with partners have a much bigger impact.

Mrs. Swan, having served on the Improving School Environment Committee, has heard about multiple programs, listened to many presentations, held many meetings, and heard presentations regarding early childhood programs and after school programs. Early childhood was the number one priority of the BERT Subcommittee.

Associate Degree Delivery Mission Differentiation

This agenda item was discussed during the Presidential Advisory Committee meeting and comments indicated it needed to be tabled for further discussion at the Coordinating Board for Higher Education meeting on December 4, 2003.

Chair Kauffman expressed the board's appreciation for the efforts and accomplishments of the COPHE/MCCA sub-committee and that they bear with the board as it requests additional time.

2003 Governor's Conference on Higher Education

Mrs. Susanne Medley stated the Governor's Conference on Higher Education is scheduled for December 4, 2003 in Springfield at the University Plaza Hotel. The theme of this year's conference is "Missouri Higher Education – Building Quality, Opportunity, and Prosperity Together." The Commission on the Future of Higher Education is tentatively scheduled to deliver their preliminary recommendations. The Governor's Award for Excellence in Teaching luncheon will follow the morning sessions.

Department of Higher Education Reorganization

Commissioner Wilson drew attention to the department's organizational chart (included behind Information Item 2), which is the department's response to the lack of funding and the necessity of achieving results. A number of positions have been combined, saving \$228,000 in the department's administrative budget. There are now eight groups responsible for support functions, internal performance, and operations, enabling a more progressive definition of performance measures and internal responsibilities. The staff has worked hard and helped make a necessary reorganization successful.

Mrs. Grove commended Commissioner Wilson on his responsible leadership in improving the quality of service the department performs.

Distribution of Community College Funds

Mr. Martin stated that about \$30 million was distributed in community college payments in the first quarter of the fiscal year. The appropriations were subject to the three percent governor's reserves and about \$3.5 million of state aid withholding from the general revenue and lottery funds, with \$600,000 distributed to St. Louis Community College.

In addition to the impact of budget cuts on the department, cuts to the Office of Administration's Division of Accounting resulted in loss of some staff, resulting in a shift of additional duties, such as the processing of financial transactions, performed by the Department of Higher Education. Mr. Martin acknowledged the additional work of Department of Higher Education staff, especially the contributions of Mrs. Janelle Jaegers, director of administration and Mrs.

Donna Imhoff of the fiscal staff. Both worked with the institutions during the transition process, enabling institutions to receive their money in a faster, more direct method..

Academic Program Actions

Dr. Stein pointed out that included in the standard academic program actions is an approval for Moberly Area Community College to deliver an associate degree program in Hannibal.

Cycle 2 Improving Teacher Quality Grants

Dr. Stein stated that the federal government has provided on an annual basis approximately \$1.2 million to the department for professional development of K-12 teachers. Higher education institutions, in partnership with K-12 schools, propose professional development projects in response to a Request for Proposal (RFP) issued by the Department of Higher Education. Dr. Cleo Samudzi and Dr. Nancy Devino of Academic Affairs, as well as Dr. John Wittstruck and Dr. Debra Cheshier of EPPIC, and others in the department have worked diligently to revise the Department of Higher Education's RFP for this program. This RFP is less restrictive and allows more creativity and innovative than previous RFPs. The evaluation process has been refocused with a separate RFP for an external evaluator of the program. The RFP will be on the department's website. A technical meeting will be held on October 17, 2003 for all interested parties.

Proprietary School Certification Actions and Reviews

Dr. Stein stated this item contains the standard program actions for the proprietary division.

Update on the Committee on Transfer and Articulation

Dr. Stein stated this item is an update on the Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA), describing results of their recent work on dual credit institutions operating in alignment with state guidelines; and a generic job description for transfer and articulation officers, and frequently asked questions on credit transfer.

The COTA committee is committed to producing an annual report to communicate more directly with presidents and chancellors on the effectiveness of transfer and articulation in the state of Missouri. They are committed to working on the transferability of proprietary credit, identifying non-traditional credits; and deciding whether credits are acceptable or not. They are trying to discover ways to reinstitute and regenerate public discussion about transfer and articulation issues.

Mrs. Grove moved **that the meeting adjourn.** Mr. Langdon seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Roster of Guests
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
October 9, 2003

Name	Affiliation
J. David Arnold	Missouri Western State College
Taylor Barnes	Northwest Missouri State University
Terry Barnes	Mineral Area College
Marla Berg-Weyer	St. Louis University
Constance Bowman	Harris-Stowe State College
Jeanie Crain	Missouri Western State College
Curtis Creagh	Lincoln University
William Lawson Culver	Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee
Barbara Dixon	Truman State University
Ken Dobbins	Southeast Missouri State University
Marsha Drennon	State Fair Community College
Don Doucette	Metropolitan Community Colleges
Nickie Foster	Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee
Tom George	University of Missouri-St. Louis
Wayne Giles	Metropolitan Community Colleges
Henry Givens, Jr.	Harris-Stowe State College
Charles Gooden	Harris-Stowe State College
Rodney Gray	Truman State University
Karen Herzog	East Central College
Dennis Holt	Southeast Missouri State University
Dean Hubbard	Northwest Missouri State University
Evelyn Jorgenson	Moberly Area Community College
James Kellerman	Missouri Community College Association
John Koffman	Former Member, Coordinating Board for Higher Education
Nikki Krawitz	University of Missouri System
Steve Lehmkuhle	University of Missouri System
Julio Leon	Missouri Southern State University-Joplin
John McGuire	St. Charles County Community College
Michael McManis	Truman State University
J. Rick Mihalevich	Linn State Technical College

Marty Oetting
Bobby Patton
Edgar Rasch
Y. T. Shah

University of Missouri System
Central Missouri State University
Maryville University of St. Louis
University of Missouri-Rolla

Gary Steffas
Jane Stephens
Janson Thomas

Metropolitan Community Colleges
Southeast Missouri State University
Governor's Youth Cabinet, Department of Higher
Education

Rochelle Tilghman
Richard Wallace

Harris-Stowe State College
University of Missouri-Columbia

Art Wallhausen

Southeast Missouri State University

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Minutes of Conference Call Meeting
November 4, 2003

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education participated in a conference call meeting at 7:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 4, 2003 at the Department of Higher Education in Jefferson City. Members participating were:

Sandy Kauffman, Chair
Lowell Kruse, Vice Chair
Dudley Grove, Secretary
John Bass
Diana Bourisaw
Marie Carmichael
Kathryn Swan
Mary Joan Wood

Members absent from the conference call meeting were:

Robert Langdon

Others participating were:

Quentin Wilson, Commissioner of Higher Education
Brenda Miner, Administrative Assistant to the Commissioner
Debra Cheshier, Director of Educational Policy, Planning and Improvement Center (EPPIC)
Jim Matchefts, Assistant Commissioner and General Council
Susanne Medley, Director, Communications and Customer Assistance
Robert Stein, Associate Commissioner Academic Affairs
John Wittstruck, Senior Research Associate (EPPIC)
Trudy Baker, Administrative Assistant (EPPIC)
Nickie Foster, Chair, Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee
Frank Christensen
Barbara Weyer
Scott Christensen
William Culver
Sue Thomson of the St. Louis Post Dispatch
Tim Kerin of the Associated Press-Kansas City

Chair Kauffman requested that participants identify themselves, called the meeting to order, and requested a roll call:

Senator Bass
Dr. Bourisaw
Mrs. Carmichael
Mrs. Grove
Chair Kauffman

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

Mr. Kruse
Mrs. Swan
Mrs. Wood

Commissioner Quentin Wilson introduced Dr. John Wittstruck who provided the following background information:

Chapter 178 of the Revised Missouri Statutes assigns the responsibility for oversight of the establishment of a new community college district to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. The proposal to establish the Lake of the Ozarks Community College was first discussed over 3 years ago. The Coordinating Board determined that the proposal met the standards described in the board's revised administrative rule which became effective on October 30, 2003.

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education is responsible for calling and conducting an election among registered voters of the proposed district on the question of establishing the new community college taxing district and the election of a Board of Trustees comprised of 6 members. Only if the proposal to establish the new community college passes, will the votes for the Board of Trustees be tallied.

Commissioner Wilson read the revision to the staff's recommendation of the Lake of the Ozarks Community College Proposal: ***Provided that MDHE staff receive, by 5:00 p.m. CST on November 10, 2003, fully signed letters of credit providing security in the total amount of \$30,000 for the estimated costs of the election for the proposed community college district at Lake of the Ozarks, ...***

The revision is related to the financial situation of the state at this time and concerns the following:

- Cost of the election;
- Clarify that this action is not a guarantee of state funding, should it pass;
- Discuss with the community college the utility of importing programs, distance learning and shared programs; and
- Staff will work closely with the Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee to assist them with a cost effective approach for maximum achievement.

Dr. Wittstruck stated that during conversations with Mrs. Nicki Foster, chair, Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee, and Mr. Frank Christensen, member, Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee, that the Steering Committee is most interested in developing a new kind of community college model. Mrs. Foster and Mr. Christensen were supportive of creating a model institution at the time of those discussions. This model institution would provide an opportunity to look at higher education's role in preparing the citizenry of Missouri for the competitiveness in the world through its education programs that support future workforce development.

Dollar figures were not requested, though the statutory language suggests what can be requested,

it is not obliged to deliver that suggested amount. The department will be an advocate in investing in this effort.

Chair Kauffman requested that Dr. Wittstruck read the motion and called for a roll call vote.

Provided that MDHE staff receive, by 5:00 p.m. CST on November 10, 2003, fully signed letters of credit providing security in the total amount of \$30,000 for the estimated costs of the election for the proposed community college district at Lake of the Ozarks, it is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education order, as authorized in section 178.800, RSMo, the submission of the following question within the public school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II to vote on the question and to elect trustees at the next following annual municipal election:

Shall there be organized within the area comprising the school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II, state of Missouri, a junior college district for the offering of 13th and 14th year courses, to be known as the "Junior College District of Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri," having the power to impose a property tax not to exceed the annual rate of twenty cents on the one hundred dollars assessed valuation of taxable property without voter approval and such additional taxes as may be approved by vote thereon, as prayed in petition filed with the Coordinating Board for Higher Education at Jefferson City, Missouri, on the Eighth day of September 2003?

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education authorize the Commissioner of Higher Education to take all necessary action for calling the election, provided security for estimated costs as described above is received.

Mrs. Kathryn Swan moved to adopt the motion. Mrs. Dudley Grove seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously with the following roll call vote:

Senator Bass -	Aye
Dr. Bourisaw -	Aye
Mrs. Carmichael -	Aye
Mrs. Grove -	Aye
Chair Kauffman -	Aye
Mr. Kruse -	Aye
Mrs. Swan -	Aye
Mrs. Wood -	Aye

Mrs. Marie Carmichael congratulated the Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee for their many years of hard work and wished them success. Mrs. Foster thanked the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, the department, Commissioner Wilson, Mr. Wittstruck, and Mr. Matchefts.

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education will call the election among registered voters of the proposed district on the following:

- Establishment of the new community college taxing district on April 6, 2004 with a yes or no vote; and
- Election of new Board of Trustees comprised of 6 members.

Upon passage of the proposed taxing district, votes for the Board of Trustees will be counted. If the proposal is not passed they will not be counted. The county clerks of Camden, Miller, Laclede, and Morgan counties will conduct the election.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Lake of the Ozarks Community College Proposal – Ratification of November 4, 2003
Conference Call Vote
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this Agenda Item is for the Coordinating Board for Higher Education to ratify its action during a telephone conference call meeting at 7:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 4, 2003. That action was to vote on the question of calling an election on Municipal Election Day, April 6, 2004 on the question of establishing a new community college taxing district involving the Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II school districts. Board members participating during the conference call meeting were: John Bass; Diana Bourisaw; Marie Carmichael; Dudley Grove; Sandra Kauffman; Lowell Kruse; Kathryn Swan; and Mary Joan Wood. Board member Robert Langdon was not available for the meeting.

Others present for the call included: Nickie Foster, Frank Christensen, Barbara Weyer, Scott Christensen, and William Culver from the Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee as well as Sue Thompson of the St. Louis Post Dispatch and Tim Curran of the Associated Press. Staff from the Department of Higher Education included Commissioner of Higher Education Quentin Wilson, Brenda Miner, Debra Cheshier, Jim Matchefts, Susanne Medley, Robert Stein, John Wittstruck, and Trudy Baker.

After discussion, the board voted on the following motion.

Provided that MDHE staff receive, by 5:00 p.m. CST on November 10, 2003, fully signed letters of credit providing security in the total amount of \$30,000 for the estimated costs of the election for the proposed community college district at Lake of the Ozarks, it is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education order, as authorized in section 178.800, RSMo, the submission of the following question within the public school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II to vote on the question and to elect trustees at the next following annual municipal election:

Shall there be organized within the area comprising the school districts of Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II, state of Missouri, a junior college district for the offering of 13th and 14th year courses, to be known as the “Junior College District of Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri,” having the power to impose a property tax not to exceed the annual rate of twenty cents on the one hundred dollars assessed valuation of taxable property without

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

voter approval and such additional taxes as may be approved by vote thereon, as prayed in petition filed with the Coordinating Board for Higher Education at Jefferson City, Missouri, on the Eighth day of September 2003?

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education authorize the Commissioner of Higher Education to take all necessary action for calling the election, provided security for estimated costs as described above is received.

Kathryn Swan moved to approve the motion which was seconded by Dudley Grove. Chair Kauffman called for a roll call vote.

John Bass	Aye
Diana Bourisaw	Aye
Marie Carmichael	Aye
Dudley Grove	Aye
Sandra Kauffman	Aye
Lowell Kruse	Aye
Kathryn Swan	Aye
Mary Joan Wood	Aye

Chair Kauffman declared the motion had passed.

For the board's information, MDHE staff received the required letters of credit before the deadline referenced in the motion.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education ratify its action of November 4, 2003 calling for an election by registered voters residing in the Camdenton R-III and School of the Osage R-II school districts on the question of establishing a new community college taxing district and the election of trustees on Municipal Election Day, April 6, 2004.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Proposed 2005 CBHE Meeting Dates and Locations
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

The established 2004 CBHE meeting dates and locations are:

DATE

February 12
April 8
June 10
October 14
December 9

LOCATION

Truman State Office Building, Jefferson City
William Woods University, Fulton
Three Rivers Community College, Poplar Bluff
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Governor's Conference on Higher Education, St. Louis

State offices will be closed on February 12, 2004 in observance of Lincoln Day. Therefore, DHE staff recommends rescheduling the February board meeting to occur on Thursday, February 19, 2004.

Listed below are the proposed 2005 CBHE meeting dates and locations:

February 10
April 14
June 9
October 13
December 8

Jefferson City
University of Missouri-Rolla, Rolla
To be determined
Ozarks Technical Community College, Springfield
Governor's Conference on Higher Education, Columbia

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.005.3, RSMo, Coordinating Board for Higher Education

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education change its meeting scheduled on February 12, 2004 to February 19, 2004 to be held in Jefferson City.

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopt the proposed 2005 meeting dates and locations.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Revised Capital Improvement Recommendations
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

The revised FY 2005 capital improvement recommendations are attached. Due to essential emergency repairs needed at the Main Building, Harris-Stowe State College has requested a change in their first priority project from new construction of the Early Childhood/Parent Education Center (\$11,433,370) to Exterior Renovation/Tuck-pointing of the Main Building (\$986,899). This revision results in a decrease of the total recommendation from \$207,175,031 to \$196,728,560, which includes fourteen projects for the public four-year institutions and Linn State Technical College.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Chapter 173, RSMo, and Chapter 33.210 – 33.290, RSMo
Section 173.020, RSMo, CBHE statutory responsibility to plan systematically for the state higher education system

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended the Board approve the revised FY 2005 capital improvement recommendations for the public four-year institutions and Linn State Technical College for submission to the Governor and General Assembly.

ATTACHMENT

Revised FY 2005 Capital Improvement Recommendations, Public Four-year Institutions and Linn State Technical College

Revised FY 2005 Capital Improvement Recommendations
PUBLIC 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
and LINN STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CBHE Priority	Inst. Priority	Institution	Facility Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost	Prior State Funding Received	FY 05 Request	FY 05 Local Match	FY 06 Request
1	1	UM-St. Louis	Benton/Stadler Halls	Renovation of science complex for chemistry, physics, psychology, and biology	\$ 66,583,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 24,169,400	\$ -	\$ 24,169,400
2	1	Southeast	Visual & Performing Arts/ Kennett Area Center	Renovation and addition at existing River Campus for school of performing arts/renovation at Kennett Center for addition of classroom & computer lab	\$ 40,003,057	\$ 4,601,000	\$ 16,092,057	\$ 19,310,000	\$ -
3	1	Northwest	Olive DeLuce Fine Arts	Complete renovation of existing fine arts building	\$ 19,713,418	\$ 1,691,651	\$ 17,753,753	\$ 268,014	\$ -
4	1	Missouri Western	Math, Phase I	Renovation and addition for math and science programs	\$ 32,205,727	\$ -	\$ 16,600,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 13,205,727
5	1	UM-Rolla	Mechanical Engineering	Phase I renovations for mechanical and aerospace engineering, and engineering mechanics departments	\$ 23,350,000	\$ -	\$ 18,617,000	\$ 4,733,000	\$ -
6	1	Southwest	FREUP Phase I	Renovation/Reutilization plan involving multiple campus facilities	\$ 30,788,529	\$ -	\$ 14,690,650	\$ -	\$ 16,097,879
7	1	Central	Morrow/Garrison	Renovation of classrooms, laboratories, gymnasiums, and general repairs for health, physical education, wellness programs	\$ 8,988,981	\$ -	\$ 8,988,981	\$ -	\$ -
8	1	Lincoln	Jason Hall	Renovation of existing facility and addition of a swim facility	\$ 8,996,537	\$ 423,195	\$ 6,573,342	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -
9	1	Truman	Baldwin/McClain Halls	Renovations and addition for social science, language, and literature	\$ 19,369,634	\$ -	\$ 17,987,054	\$ 1,382,580	\$ -
10	1	Linn State	HTAC- Heavy Equip/ Med Truck/Auto Collision	Construction of a new facility for heavy equipment technology, medium/ heavy truck technology, trailer repair and auto collision repair	\$ 11,105,056	\$ -	\$ 5,427,644	\$ 1,356,911	\$ 4,320,501
11	1	Harris-Stowe*	Exterior Renovation/ Tuck-pointing Main Bldg	Renovate the exterior masonry and stonework on the main building, including tuck-pointing	\$ 986,899	\$ -	\$ 986,899	\$ -	\$ -
12	1	Missouri Southern	Health Sciences Building	Construction of a new facility for consolidation of allied health programs, psychology, and wellness	\$ 15,323,725	\$ 294,000	\$ 12,023,780	\$ 3,005,945	\$ -
13	1	UM-Columbia**	Engineering East	Renovations of the capsule pipeline research center and the following engineering depts: chemical, civil, mechanical & aerospace, and nuclear	\$ 20,910,000	\$ -	\$ 20,910,000	\$ -	\$ -
14	1	UM-Kansas City***	Chilled Water Plant Steam Utility	Add chilled water plant to expand existing chilled water capacity and renovate existing central cooling plant.	\$ 29,869,000	\$ -	\$ 15,908,000	\$ -	\$ 13,961,000
TOTALS					\$ 328,193,563	\$ 10,509,846	\$ 196,728,560	\$ 34,456,450	\$ 71,754,507

*Due to essential emergency repairs, HSSC requested a revision of their first priority from the Early Childhood/Parent Education Center to Exterior Renovation/Tuck-pointing of the Main Building on November 10, 2003.

**Under HB 20, \$28,947,000 was reappropriated to UMC for a life sciences building in FY 04.

***Under HB 19, UMKC was appropriated \$30,490,400 for a pharmacy and nursing (life sciences) building in FY 04.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Performance Excellence Funding
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

Increasingly, Missouri's policymakers responsible for determining state appropriations to public colleges and universities have agreed with a basic tenet of performance-based budgeting, i.e., by integrating a portion of state funding with results, performance on statewide priorities will improve. The intent of this agenda item is to recommend a specific amount of the board's FY 2005 budget request for public colleges and universities to be designated for a Performance Excellence Funding initiative to begin in FY 2005. In addition, specific parameters to guide development of a Performance Excellence Funding model are identified for board review and approval.

Background

At its October 2003 board meeting, the CBHE approved a FY 2005 budget request for public colleges and universities totaling \$831,706,164. By forwarding this budget recommendation to the Governor and the General Assembly, the board expressed its commitment to seek restoration of the FY 2004 budget withholdings.

The board also acknowledged performance-based budgeting as a viable and desirable strategy to promote quality and performance excellence. Furthermore, the board agreed that a portion of the FY 2005 budget request associated with restoration of the withholding should be dedicated to performance excellence funding. Specific components of a Performance Excellence Funding model will be developed prior to the start of the next fiscal year in continued conversation with the higher education community. A decision about the amount of performance excellence funding, however, must be made by December 2003 if it is to be considered by the Governor and the General Assembly as part of the board's FY 2005 budget request.

Immediately following the October board meeting, DHE staff began to visit with several education and legislative leaders about a Performance Excellence Funding initiative that would build upon the lessons learned from Missouri's previous experience with its Funding for Results initiative. In addition, representatives from COPHE and MCCA participated in a conference call on November 17 with DHE staff to identify key challenges and issues and to build consensus through dialogue about moving forward with Performance Excellence Funding.

Presidents and chancellors have expressed agreement with the overall objectives of performance funding as a strategy to effect systemic change. At the same time, concerns have been raised

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
October 9, 2003

about the mechanics of a new performance funding initiative, e.g., the amount of funding, the identification of priority outcomes, and other related parameters. The difficulty of initiating a performance funding initiative while institutions are also addressing increased costs and reduction in state funding has also been expressed.

Amount of Performance Excellence Funding

The amount of the budget dedicated to performance excellence funding should be enough to influence behavior, but not so much that it will undermine the stability of the system or of any individual institution. Furthermore, results associated with Performance Excellence Projects will be limited in the first year of operation.

During this first year, the staff recommends that a total of .5 percent of the FY 2005 budget request for public colleges and universities be dedicated to Performance Excellence Funding. This amount represents approximately \$4.1 million dollars. Using this percentage, the amount per institution for community colleges and Linn State Technical College ranges from \$12,169 to \$224,762. For the four-year institutions, the range is from \$47,905 to \$1,943,695. Clearly the type, scope, and magnitude of performance funding initiatives will vary based on the total amount of funding each institution may earn. While performance funding at a higher level is a worthy long-term goal, it should be phased in over time, as a culture of evidence for performance excellence becomes apparent.

Parameters for a Performance Excellence Funding Initiative

There is general agreement that performance excellence funding should serve as an incentive to promote institutionally-driven projects that are in alignment with and contribute to a limited number of statewide priority goals for higher education. In addition, support has been expressed for designing a performance excellence funding model that emphasizes flexibility and promotes customized projects that fit with institutional missions.

In reviewing higher education goals identified by various groups, the COPHE/MCCA subcommittee identified the following three areas as appropriate for institutionally-driven performance excellence funding projects: Campus Quality Improvement, Value-added Student Learning, and K-12 Teacher Quality. Institutions would be expected to focus on one of these key areas, although overlap and integration of more than one area would be possible. In addition, projects would be expected to be data-driven, with baseline data included and a commitment by institutions to demonstrate continuous movement toward a targeted goal.

Conclusions

A commitment to Performance Excellence Funding, even during tight fiscal times, represents the potential impact of Missouri's resource allocation model to shape state priorities and fosters systemic reform. The decision to start small, i.e., approximately \$4.1 million dollars out of a state investment of over \$800 million dollars, provides an appropriate balance between institutional pressures to meet increased costs and mandatory expenditures while at the same time. Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

time designating a small portion of the budget as an investment for important improvement projects.

The identification of a narrow range of priority areas around which institutions will design performance excellence projects with limited resources ensures a focus that is central to the core functions of higher education and that will address statewide priorities. An emphasis on quality initiatives is consistent with the commitment of the board to move from a regulatory agency to one that reinforces the importance of assessment and the implementation of responsible reporting systems that promote improvement and quality, and thereby ensure accountability. Measuring value-added student learning will help Missouri institutions demonstrate their effectiveness as investments in Missouri's future. Teacher quality, as the single most important factor affecting student learning, will affect the preparation level and eventual success of the state's students and workforce.

Establishing Performance Excellence Funding for institutions with an emphasis on results in one or a combination of these three areas has the potential to increase the board's success in providing Missouri citizens with the highest quality postsecondary education system resulting in a thriving economy and an outstanding quality of life.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 163.191, RSMo, CBHE statutory responsibility to develop an appropriations request for community colleges
Sections 173.005.2(2), 173.030(3), and 173.040(5), RSMo, CBHE statutory responsibility to establish guidelines for appropriations requests and to recommend a budget for each state-supported college or university
Section 173.005.2(7), RSMo, CBHE statutory responsibility for gathering data from state-supported institutions

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education approve that .5 percent (\$4,158,531) of its FY 2005 budget request for public colleges and universities be dedicated to a new Performance Excellence Funding initiative.

It is further recommended that the board adopt the following parameters to be used as guiding principles for the development of its Performance Excellence Funding initiative for FY 2005:

- **Results should contribute to statewide priorities**
- **Flexibility should be encouraged**
- **Customized projects that fit with institutional Missions should be promoted**
- **Proposals for performance excellence funding projects should be designed around one (or a combination) of the following areas:**

- **Campus Quality Improvement Projects**
 - **Value-added Student Learning Projects**
 - **K-12 Teacher Quality Projects**
-
- **Projects must be data-driven**
 - **Reporting formats should be standardized and emphasize quality processes and evidence of performance improvement**

It is further recommended that DHE staff work with the MCCA/COPHE subcommittee on Performance Excellence Funding to develop processes and procedures for implementing a Performance Excellence Funding model for the FY 2005 budget appropriation. These policies and procedures should be presented to the board for review and action no later than June 2004.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Proposed Public Policy Guidelines for Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

Missouri's system of higher education includes participation by institutions from all postsecondary educational sectors in the delivery of collegiate-level lower division coursework, lower division certificates, and associate degrees. The need for clarification concerning the board's public policy framework for these activities was acknowledged by the board at its October 2002 board meeting. The intent of this agenda item is to provide the board with recommended Public Policy Guidelines on Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery for review and action.

Background

There continues to be an increased demand for education and training at the two-year level, including a demand for accessible lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degree programs as well as for non-degree workforce development. Increasingly, Missouri's economy will be affected by the number of its citizens who complete some postsecondary education.

While community colleges provide a low-cost opportunity for postsecondary education, a substantial number of school districts, and therefore Missouri citizens, are located outside a community college taxing district and have limited access to courses and programs at the two-year level. DHE staff review of Missouri's two-year delivery system identified a need for greater access to high quality lower-division educational opportunities while avoiding unnecessary duplication. The work of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education and the recommendations of the National Collaborative also identified a need in Missouri for additional access to lower-division programming throughout the state.

The complexity of Missouri's public higher education system makes it difficult to develop concise policy guidelines that will apply to all situations concerning delivery of lower-division courses, lower-division certificates, and associate degree programs. In some locations, institutions exist side-by-side, while in other communities there are no local campuses. This condition suggests that one approach to delivery will not fit all situations.

After 10 months of deliberation, a draft set of institutional agreements was developed by a COPHE/MCCA subcommittee, was submitted to DHE staff, and was distributed to postsecondary institutions for review and comment. The proposed draft agreement represented extensive work and compromise by institutional representatives from different educational sectors. The draft document provided a good foundation for meeting citizens' needs and for institutions to be responsive to the demands of Missouri's workforce. Overall, the proposed agreement established the following:

- Ideal principles associated with trust, collaboration, and local control
- Eligibility criteria for delivery of associate degrees by public institutions
- Primary roles and responsibilities connected to lower-division coursework and associate degree delivery for public institutions based on institutional mission
- Limitations on lower-division delivery by public four-year institutions away from the main campus
- Inclusion of training and workforce development and dual credit coursework
- General guidelines directing institutional aspirations

In reviewing the draft agreement, DHE staff acknowledged its strengths, identified a few shortcomings, and recommended that additional areas be addressed before formally presenting a policy document for board review and action. In October 2003, the board directed the DHE staff to continue working with institutional representatives and to prepare a recommendation for board review and action to be presented at the December 2003 meeting.

A new draft document written as a policy statement was distributed to the academic community for review and comment on November 7, 2003. The new draft represented DHE staff work with the COPHE/MCCA subcommittee and included additional detail about ways to meet the needs of local communities and employers for accessible lower-division coursework, lower-division certificate programs, and associate degrees. In addition, the new draft included a section on duplication, a set of guiding principles, and a separate section on conflict resolution.

Conclusions

There is general agreement that Missouri's citizens and employers will benefit from a cost-effective, well-articulated, high-quality delivery system for two-year education. The attached Policy Guidelines for Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery establish a public policy framework designed to:

- support increased access;
- reinforce the importance of regional planning;
- promote alignment of institutional aspirations with state needs;
- encourage collaboration and effective utilization of instructional technology;
- foster local decision-making;
- emphasize quality principles as a management tool;
- acknowledge existing institutional commitments and minimal duplication of effort;
- specify the importance of existing program review;

- build upon related CBHE policies; and
- resolve conflicts in a fair and timely manner.

The proposed Policy Guidelines clarify expectations concerning public institutional practices associated with lower-division coursework, lower-division certificate programs, and associate degree delivery. The needs of the state as well as those of particular regions and the missions of institutions are identified as primary drivers for program planning and program delivery. If adopted, these Policy Guidelines will continue to reduce Missouri's regulatory environment and will increase the emphasis on performance excellence.

It is important to note that, if approved, the proposed Policy Guidelines do not change the current working relationship of the CBHE and DHE to independent or proprietary sector institutions. Institutions in both of these sectors are acknowledged because of their involvement in lower-division coursework, lower-division certificate, and associate degree delivery, and for their significant contribution toward meeting the needs of Missouri's citizens and employers. Independent and proprietary sector institutions that have an interest are encouraged to participate in regional planning and to explore potential collaborative endeavors that will benefit local communities and the state.

Presidents/chancellors have had limited time to comment on the earlier draft document that was distributed to the academic community. Of the comments received to date, one public four-year institution has expressed grave concern with the proposed policy guidelines and provided suggestions for change as well as commentary on various sections of the document. Some of the key concerns expressed by this institution include:

- A belief that collaboration cannot be allowed to undermine the financial stability or academic integrity of the institution
- A desire for more specificity concerning unnecessary duplication, local decision-making, and quality processes
- A perception that the document places undue burden on four-year institutions as totally responsible for collaboration and good faith
- A belief that conflicts should be sent to the CBHE for resolution rather than to the Commissioner
- A belief that the right to enter into formal litigation should be included in the document

Another public institution has suggested the following:

- Recognize four-year institutions that are not open-enrollment but have an historic mission of providing career and technical programs as having responsibility for one- and two-year certificates and associate degree programs
- Expand primary provider boundaries for public four-year institutions to include locations in which there are no public two-year institutions that are within a reasonable commuting distance from the four-year institution

Two independent institutions have registered concerns about the applicability of some of the document to the independent sector. The most recent draft clarifies that several statements apply to public institutions only and includes a footnote that the proposed policy guidelines do not change the current working relationship of the CBHE and the DHE to independent and proprietary institutions.

Furthermore, institutions have been notified that any comments received by DHE staff before the December 4, 2003 board meeting will be acknowledged during the staff presentation to the board. In addition, the DHE staff will share any concerns received with the leadership of COPHE, MCCA, ICUM, MAPCS and Linn State Technical College and will encourage their review and comment prior to the board meeting.

The attached proposed Policy Guidelines include some minor changes from the November 7, 2003 draft distributed to presidents/chancellors and include a glossary at the end of the document that was not in the previous draft.

Normally, institutional presidents/chancellors discuss any action items with CBHE board members during the CBHE Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting scheduled before the formal board meeting. Because no CBHE PAC meeting is scheduled in December, one representative from each educational sector should be offered an opportunity to provide public testimony to the board about the proposed Policy Guidelines before formal board action is taken.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 163.191.3-.4, RSMo, Off-campus instruction by community colleges

Section 193.030(4), RSMo, Promulgating rules for off-campus sites

Section 173.020, RSMo, CBHE statutory responsibility to plan systematically for the state higher education system

Section 173.030(7) and (8), RSMo, Pertaining to the board's statutory authority to undertake a mission review of the state's public four-year colleges and universities every five years

Section 174.160, RSMo, Pertaining to authority to confer degrees

Section 174.231, Pertaining to Missouri Southern State College's mission statement

Section 174.251, Pertaining to Missouri Western State College's mission statement

Section 174.500, Pertaining to the establishment of West Plains Campus of Southwest Missouri State University

Sections 178.637.1-.2, RSMo, Pertaining to the board's statutory responsibility to develop a five-year plan for Linn State Technical College and the state's system of postsecondary technical and community college education

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education approve the Public Policy Guidelines for Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery.

It is further recommended that these public policy guidelines become effective December 8, 2003.

It is further recommended that these public policy guidelines be evaluated for their overall effectiveness with a report due to the Coordinating Board by December 2006.

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education commend the presidents and chancellors for their extensive work, their leadership, and their commitment to a well-articulated, high-quality, and cost-effective postsecondary lower-division delivery system.

It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Higher Education distribute these public policy guidelines to all institutions and notify presidents and chancellors of the board's actions related to this agenda item.

ATTACHMENT

Proposed Public Policy Guidelines on Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery

Proposed Public Policy Guidelines on Lower-division Coursework, Lower-division Certificate, and Associate-degree Delivery
Last Revised November 20, 2003

1. Introduction

- 1.1** Missouri has a complex, diverse system of postsecondary public, independent and proprietary institutions that offer a rich array of instructional courses and programs in support of undergraduate certificate and degree programs. Undergraduate educational opportunities are provided on campuses throughout the state, off-campus and outside of community college taxing districts, and through distance learning utilizing advanced technologies.
- 1.2** Institutions across all sectors are committed to providing easy access to high quality undergraduate certificate and degree programs that are responsive to the state's needs for a highly-trained workforce and an educated citizenry. Missouri's public institutions are also committed to an efficient higher education system without unnecessary duplication of programs and courses funded by the state and to ensure that all Missouri citizens have access to affordable undergraduate education and training opportunities.

2. Statutory Responsibility

- 2.1** According to Section 173.020 (2), (3) and (4) RSMo, the CBHE has responsibility for identifying higher education needs in the state; developing arrangements for more effective and economical specialization in types of education programs offered and students served, and for more effective coordination and mutual support among institutions in the utilization of facilities, faculty and other resources; and designing a coordinated plan for higher education in the state. The CBHE performs this responsibility through working with presidents/chancellors and chief academic officers in developing accountable, efficient and fair program delivery policies.

3. Program and Degree-level Responsibility

- 3.1** The three primary postsecondary sectors responsible for undergraduate course and program delivery are the public, independent, and proprietary sectors. A description of the responsibility of each sector in program delivery follows:

a. Public Sector Institutions

Two-year public institutions and open-enrollment public four-year institutions with an historic mission of providing career and technical programs have responsibility for delivery of lower-division one-and two-year certificate programs and associate degrees. In addition, all public

four-year institutions have responsibility for delivery of baccalaureate-level programs.

b. Independent Sector Institutions*

Independent institutions contribute significantly to the diversity and choice of educational programs provided to Missouri citizens. Independent two- and four-year colleges and universities deliver an array of undergraduate courses and programs consistent with their missions.

c. Proprietary Sector Institutions*

Proprietary institutions contribute to the postsecondary education and training opportunities provided to Missouri citizens. Proprietary schools range from single program schools that offer short-term certificates to accredited degree-granting institutions offering a range of courses and programs at multiple educational levels. These institutions are responsible for delivering educational programs consistent with the standards established by the Coordinating Board.

4. Duplication of Effort

- 4.1** Missouri's colleges and universities are committed to mission focus as a way of promoting programmatic excellence in order to meet targeted demographic and employment needs of the state's employers. Working collaboratively, the CBHE and the state's postsecondary education institutions strive to have a balanced and well-coordinated system composed of separate institutions each with its own governing structure.
- 4.2** By its very nature, however, Missouri's postsecondary education system (similar to postsecondary systems in other states) involves necessary duplication. An overlapping core of certificate and degree programs is offered on many campuses to provide Missouri citizens with easy access to postsecondary educational and training opportunities in close proximity to their home and/or work locations. Another desirable aspect of this overlap includes the existence of programs in similar subject areas delivered by alternate means or in different formats in order to meet the needs of students and employers.
- 4.3** The overlap among institutions in lower-division coursework is extensive because of lower-division course requirements that students must complete to receive undergraduate certificates and degrees. Furthermore, a full complement of lower-division general education coursework is offered by Missouri's public and

**The proposed policy guidelines do not change the current working relationship of the CBHE and the DHE to independent and proprietary institutions.*

independent institutions, and some of Missouri's proprietary institutions, thereby complicating the assignment of a particular public sector or set of public institutions as the primary points of access to higher education in the state. Some investments (at both the two- and four-year institutions) have been made to expand access to lower-division coursework and programs, including the offering of lower-division dual credit courses at high schools throughout the state, which creates additional overlap of function across sectors. Developmental courses are also offered by two- and four-year institutions due to the various needs of students and the practicality of delivering such courses.

5. Demand

- 5.1** There is an increased demand for education and training at all postsecondary levels, including lower-division one- and two-year certificates and associate degree programs as well as for non-degree workforce development. Increasingly, some amount of postsecondary education is required to be successful in most jobs. Similarly, Missouri's economy is affected by the number of its citizens who complete some postsecondary education. To have an effective, well-articulated certificate and associate degree-delivery system, Missouri's institutions need a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities associated with lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degrees.

6. Policy Framework

- 6.1** For public institutions, the board's policy framework on lower-division certificates and associate degree programs has relied on a regulatory environment, especially concerning the development of new degree programs and the offering of courses and programs off-campus or outside community college taxing districts. In relation to independent and proprietary institutions, the CBHE has encouraged cooperation and collaboration to evolve a streamlined, efficient, quality higher education system.
- 6.2** Despite steps to deregulate Missouri's public policy environment concerning lower-division coursework and delivery of lower-division certificate and associate degree programs, Missouri's framework has resulted in multiple providers, which creates the potential for reduced efficiency through an unnecessary duplication of effort.
- 6.3** In some geographic areas, postsecondary institutions are located in close proximity, while in others, communities and their residents are far from the taxing district boundaries of a community college, the home site of another two-year institution, or a four-year campus. The complexity of Missouri's educational system suggests that one approach to meeting state needs for cost-effective, high quality, lower-division certificates and associate degree programs will not fit all situations. Improving access and improved educational attainment for Missouri

citizens will require multiple approaches, built upon mutual trust and a spirit of collaboration.

7. Guiding Principles

- 7.1** The state's postsecondary education system should be responsive to the needs of Missouri citizens for increased access to lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degree programs.
- 7.2** Regional planning involving business and community leaders, educational providers across all postsecondary sectors, and policymakers should be utilized to ensure responsiveness to state needs and a minimum of unnecessary duplication in course and program offerings.
- 7.3** Community colleges involved in regional planning should continue to utilize community college service regions as a useful tool.
- 7.4** Institutional aspirations should be designed within the context of statewide needs and priorities for a thriving economy supported by high quality, affordable education and training programs.
- 7.5** The best delivery models, including ones that involve collaborative ventures and effective utilization of instructional technology, should be identified to promote increased access to and success in lower-division coursework, and certificate and associate degree programs.
- 7.6** Eligibility for developing new lower-division certificate and associate degree program proposals at public institutions should be described clearly and concisely as should the process for resolving differences about lower-division course delivery at locations other than the main campus of the institution.
- 7.7** To the extent possible, local decision-making should be utilized to resolve differences among institutions rather than superimposing solutions developed by external groups.
- 7.8** Institutional differences should be addressed quickly based on an agreed-upon process to resolve conflicts between and among institutions.
- 7.9** Institutions should engage in regular and systematic review of all lower-division certificate and associate degree programs to ensure faculty engagement in department-based structured conversations about educational quality processes that focus on good practice and spur improvement including consolidation, expansion, or deletion of courses and/or programs.

8. Certificate and Associate Degrees

- 8.1** Public two-year institutions should be the primary providers of lower-division certificates and associate degrees offered by public colleges and universities throughout the state, including those involving web-based delivery.
- 8.2** Public, open-admissions institutions that have an historic mission of providing career and technical education at the lower-division certificate and associate degree level may continue to offer previously approved lower-division certificates and associate degrees, unless otherwise limited or restricted by statute.
- 8.3** Previously approved lower-division certificates and associate degrees offered by public institutions that are not open-admissions institutions should be continued only if student demand and employer needs warrant continuation, unless otherwise restricted by statute.
- 8.4** Public institutions that are not open-admission institutions are encouraged to phase out associate degrees over a five-year period, with the assumption that two-year institutions or open-admissions four-year institutions will assume responsibility for existing programs that continue to have demand and/or meet state needs.
- 8.5** New lower-division certificates and associate degree program proposals for delivery by public institutions must undergo review and approval by the Commissioner of Higher Education prior to implementation following the guidelines established by the CBHE for academic program review and clarifying comments.
- 8.6** Development and delivery of web-based lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degree programs should be aligned with the CBHE Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning/Web-Based Courses.
- 8.7** As outlined in the CBHE policy for New Program Approval, new proposals for lower-division certificates and associate degrees for delivery by public institutions must demonstrate: alignment with mission; demonstrable need (including evidence of, and a rationale for, the importance of the proposed program to Missouri's economy and educational opportunities for more Missourians); efficient use of resources; and a rationale for collaborating or for moving forward alone.
- 8.8** Proposals for new lower-division certificates and associate degrees from public colleges and universities should be developed in consultation and collaboration with educational providers and business leaders in a particular service region.
- 8.9** Public two-year institutions should be the lower-division certificate or degree-granting institution for any new lower-division certificates or associate degrees to be offered by public institutions with the following stipulations:

- a.** Public two-year institutions proposing to provide lower-division certificates or associate degrees outside a taxing district are expected to work collaboratively with existing local partners by building on currently available general education and occupation-related coursework, and by utilizing the human resources and facilities of local providers. Public four-year institutions as well as other education providers are expected to collaborate in good faith with the proposing public two-year institution.
 - b.** If a public two-year institution is unable to meet the demands for new lower-division certificates or associate degrees, public four-year institutions may be approved to offer new lower-division certificates or associate degrees.
- 8.10** New lower-division certificates and associate degree program proposals for delivery by independent institutions should undergo review by the Commissioner of Higher Education with an opportunity for comment prior to implementation.
- 8.11** New lower-division certificates and associate degree programs proposals for delivery by proprietary schools must meet statutory and Department of Higher Education minimum standards for programs offered at these institutions.

9. Lower-division Coursework

- 9.1** Public institutions agree to communicate openly with other public institutions about plans to deliver lower-division coursework at a location other than the main campus.
- 9.2** Generally, for courses offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus, public two-year institutions will be the primary providers of lower-division coursework with the following stipulations:
 - a.** Within the taxing district of a community college, the community college will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.
 - b.** Within the county in which a public four-year institution is located, the public four-year institution will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.
 - c.** In cases where the public four-year institution cannot or chooses not to meet the needs of the county in which it is located for accessible lower-division coursework, public two-year institutions, where appropriate, may offer such coursework.

- d.** Within the county in which the state's public technical college is located, the state's public technical college will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.
 - e.** Within the county in which a public two-year branch campus of a public four-year institution is located, the public two-year branch campus will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.
 - f.** In situations when there is overlap between the taxing district of a community college and the county in which a public four-year college or university, the state's technical college, or a two-year branch campus of a public institution is located, the affected institutions agree to collaborate in determining the institution best suited to deliver lower-division coursework offered by a public institution.
 - g.** For new coursework delivered in geographic areas outside both community college taxing districts and the counties in which public four-year institutions, the state's technical college, or the branch campus of a public four-year institution are located, the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution should be the institution best suited by mission, proximity, cost effectiveness, and/or expertise to meet the needs of the service area and to demonstrate value-added student learning.
 - h.** In situations in which there is a perceived unmet need for accessible lower-division coursework not met by the public institution(s) delegated primary responsibility for lower-division coursework, other public institutions may deliver coursework in such locations, with the understanding that they notify the local institution(s) and agree to work collaboratively in determining the best ways for public higher education to respond to unmet needs.
- 9.3** Training and workforce development offered for lower-division credit at off-campus locations will be subject to the conditions set forth in Section 9.2 (a-f).
- 9.4** All dual credit courses offered in high schools by colleges and universities are considered lower-division coursework. Public sector providers of dual credit courses at all locations and those independent/proprietary institutions choosing to abide by statewide guidelines associated with dual credit course delivery will be those institutions best suited by proximity to ensure that the CBHE guidelines for oversight of quality delivery are followed, including that college or university

faculty provide oversight for course comparability; that college or university faculty mentor, observe, and evaluate high school teachers; that high school teachers participate in college orientation and professional development activities; and that college or university faculty review student work and provide oversight for assessment of student outcomes.

10. Existing Program Review

(It should be noted that the CBHE policy concerning existing program review is currently being revised to include all programs at public institutions and to be aligned with quality principles and institutional authority for local decision-making.)

- 10.1** Institutions should move towards using/adopting quality principles as a management tool and systematically evaluate the appropriateness of all lower-division certificates and associate degrees on a regular schedule.
- 10.2** The review of existing lower-division certificates and associate degrees should be aligned with the revision of campus-based reviews that will emphasize quality processes and academic audits and will deemphasize regulation.
- 10.3** Institutions should establish standards and processes to use in evaluating lower-division certificates and associate degrees, including the extent to which these programs help meet the state's workforce development needs.
- 10.4** State data collection obligations on existing programs should be kept to a minimum. Duplicative data collection efforts should be integrated into a single process serving multiple functions.
- 10.5** Oversight for existing program review provided by the CBHE will emphasize audits of quality processes, will serve to demonstrate accountability to external constituents, and should also be used by institutions as a catalyst for continuous improvement.

11. Existing Commitments

- 11.1** Existing off-campus sites that have CBHE approval or substantial investment in facilities may continue to operate.
- 11.2** Existing relationships between colleges and universities and high schools that have been effective in providing quality dual credit courses to high school students may be maintained.
- 11.3** All lower-division certificate and associate degree programs, regardless of prior approval or commitments, should engage in regular and systematic review.

12. Conflict Resolution

- 12.1** Presidents/chancellors of public institutions agree to communicate in a direct, concise, and timely manner about any disagreements associated with the implementation of these policy guidelines.
- 12.2** Any disagreements between and among public institutions will be resolved quickly at a local level whenever possible.
- 12.3** Presidents/chancellors of public institutions agree to engage educators from non-involved institutions to facilitate resolution for any conflicts that remain unresolved after two months of good faith efforts at resolution on the local level. The educators identified will be part of a facilitation team that works with the affected parties in an attempt to resolve any conflicts.
- 12.4** The facilitation team will gather information about the unresolved conflict(s) and hold a meeting with the presidents/chancellors and chief academic officers of the institutions involved in a disagreement(s) in an attempt to facilitate resolution of the conflict.
- 12.5** Each of the affected public institutions in an unresolved conflict also has the option to request formal mediation. If formal mediation is pursued, all affected institutions agree to share in the expenses associated with retaining a mediator.
- 12.6** If the conflict remains unresolved two weeks after the facilitation team meeting and/or the use of a formal mediator, each public institution agrees to submit in writing a summary of the unresolved conflict to the Commissioner of Higher Education.
- 12.7** The Commissioner of Higher Education will determine a resolution and communicate it to all of the involved parties within one month after receiving written notification of an unresolved conflict.
- 12.8** Decisions of the Commissioner of Higher Education shall be binding on the affected institutions.

13. Glossary

Associate Degree:

An earned academic degree with the term "associate" in the title and normally requiring at least 60 semester credit hours or equivalent at the lower-division level.

Commissioner of Higher Education:

Head of the Department of Higher Education and appointed by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

Community College Taxing District:

A community taxing district is a local district in which the community calls for a local election at which the registered voters decide the question of taxing themselves to establish a community college in their area of the state. Community college taxing districts are local political subdivisions with local control and governance over the services being provided.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE):

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education, established by Section 173.005.2, RSMo 1986.

Community College Service Regions:

Agreed-upon regional boundaries throughout Missouri in which one community college is assigned per region.

Degree:

An award conferred upon an individual by a college, university, or other postsecondary education institution as official recognition for the successful completion of a postsecondary educational program or course of study.

Developmental Courses:

A set of instructional activities designed to ensure adequate preparation for access to collegiate-level work for students with deficiencies. These courses generally do not satisfy requirements for a formal certificate or degree.

Dual Credit:

Collegiate-level courses taught in high schools to high school students who receive, simultaneously, both high school and college-level course credit.

General Education Coursework:

A prescribed course of study, as defined by institutional faculty and validated by the institution's administration or governing board, distinct from a program major, required of all graduates, and intended to ensure that all graduates possess a common core of collegiate-level skills and knowledge.

Independent Sector Institution:

A postsecondary educational institution controlled by a private individual(s) or by a nongovernmental agency, usually supported primarily by other than public funds, and operated by other than publicly elected or appointed officials.

Lower-Division Certificate:

A formal award conferred upon an individual by a college, university, or other postsecondary education institution as official recognition for the successful completion of a postsecondary educational program or course of study. The program or course of study consists of non-remedial courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with freshman or sophomore students and is offered primarily by two-year institutions.

Lower-Division Coursework:

Courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with freshman and sophomore students and offered by both two- and four-year institutions.

Off-Campus Site:

All locations other than the main campus. For public community colleges, off-campus sites include all locations outside a community college's taxing district and all dual credit courses offered in high schools regardless of location. For public four-year colleges, the state's two-year technical college, and any branch campuses of four-year institutions, off-campus sites include all locations other than the main campus.

Primary Provider:

A public postsecondary institution with the principal responsibility for addressing the instructional/programmatic needs of citizens in a community or region.

Program Review:

The process by which the academic department (or program) evaluates its strengths and weaknesses through a self study and presents results, a plan for improvement, and writes a report for its own future use and/or use by external stakeholders monitoring the process.

Proprietary Sector Institution:

A privately controlled education institution certified to operate by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education pursuant to Sections 173.600 through 173.619, RSMo, and accredited by an accrediting commission recognized by the United States Department of Education that provides a postsecondary course of instruction leading to a certificate or degree.

Public Sector Institution:

A postsecondary educational institution established by statute or the Missouri Constitution whose programs and activities are operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials, and which is partially supported by public funds.

Training and Workforce Development Programs:

Instructional programs designed to improve specific skills, knowledge, and competencies of individuals who are already in the workforce and/or those preparing to enter the workforce.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Tab

- 1 Distribution of Community College Funds
- 2 Proprietary School Certification Actions and Reviews
- 3 Appointments to the CBHE Proprietary School Advisory Committee
- 4 Academic Program Actions

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Distribution of Community College Funds
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

The process for making state aid payments to the community colleges in FY 2004 will be made monthly. All FY 2004 state aid appropriations are subject to a 3 percent governor's reserve. State aid withholdings of \$2,948,740 in general revenue funds and \$563,225 in lottery funds took effect July 2, 2003. The first state aid payment of FY 2004 appropriations to community colleges occurred in July.

The payment schedule for October and November 2003 state aid distributions is summarized below.

State Aid (excluding M&R) – GR portion	\$ 12,584,072
State Aid – lottery portion	805,682
Workforce Preparation – GR portion	2,357,106
Workforce Preparation – lottery portion	215,396
Out-of-District Programs	185,668
Technical Education	3,228,426
Workforce Preparation for TANF Recipients	259,572
Maintenance and Repair	<u>1,054,247</u>
TOTAL	\$ 20,690,169

In addition, a payment for capital appropriations, pursuant to House Bill 20 (previously House Bill 16), was made in the amount of \$14,201 to St. Louis Community College and \$240,655 to Jefferson College.

The total distribution of state higher education funds to community colleges during this period is \$20,945,025.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 163.191, RSMo

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Proprietary School Certification Actions and Reviews
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

All program actions that have occurred since the October 9, 2003 Coordinating Board meeting are reported in this information item. In addition, the report includes information concerning anticipated actions on applications to establish new postsecondary education institutions and exemptions from the department's certification requirements.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Sections 173.600 through 173.618, RSMo, Regulation of Proprietary Schools

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT

Proprietary School Certification Program Actions and Reviews

Coordinating Board for Higher Education

Proprietary School Certification Program Actions and Reviews

Certificates of Approval Issued (Authorization for Instructional Delivery)

CompUSA

Sunset Hills, Missouri

CompUSA Training Centers are a for-profit, wholly owned subsidiary of CompUSA Stores, a Texas-based limited partnership. CompUSA offers a wide range of instructional coursework including both nonvocational courses (basic training on specific software programs that do not qualify a student for employment) and advanced technical training programs. The advanced technical training programs are subject to certification program requirements and “are designed as intensive courses to help prepare individuals to take industry certification tests.” The Missouri location offers eight nondegree certification preparation programs ranging from one to 14 weeks in length. The school is not accredited.

Ottawa University

Unity Village, Missouri

This regionally accredited (North Central Association) not-for-profit higher education institution is establishing a Missouri instructional delivery site, in cooperation with Unity Village, in order to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration degree. Officials of Unity Village requested Ottawa University to establish this program for the benefit of its employees. Reorganization of the institutions operations in the Kansas City metropolitan area (both Kansas and Missouri) are anticipated and will likely lead to additional programs to be offered through this site.

Certificates of Approval Issued (Authorization Only to Recruit Students in Missouri)

University of Phoenix On-line

Phoenix, Arizona

This regionally accredited (North Central Association) for-profit institution offers a wide range of on-line degree programs ranging from the associate to the doctoral level. While distance education programs by out-of-state institutions are not usually subject to review and approval through the certification process, the institution employs individuals in Missouri who recruit students, particularly through corporate contacts, into the program. As a result of this activity, the school was considered subject to certification requirements.

Applications Pending Approval (Authorization for Instructional Delivery)

Skyline Aeronautics
Chesterfield, Missouri

This for-profit, limited liability company operates a full-service flight training school in addition to its aircraft rental and maintenance facility. The school offers private, instrument, and commercial pilot training programs. Although the school is approved and certified by the Federal Aviation Administration, it is not accredited.

International University, Inc.
Grandview, Missouri

This not-for-profit corporation operates multiple institutions in the state. Those institutions include the International University, the College of Security, Technology, and Management, the College of Homeland Security, and the International Bible College. Although consideration of the application was originally deferred due to a connection with an exempt institution, recent information indicates these institutions now operate independently. As a consequence, the completion of the application review has been initiated. The schools included within this group offer programs in more than 25 subject areas and at all levels from certificate through the doctorate. The school is not accredited.

Applications Pending Approval (Authorization Only to Recruit Students)

Westwood College of Technology
DuPage, Illinois

This for-profit school operates under the corporate ownership of Alta Colleges. Westwood College operates numerous campuses in four states as well as an on-line education division. The school states its mission as providing “quality career-focused technical programs of instruction that give students the knowledge, skills and abilities they need to earn degree, diplomas and certificates and for their subsequent careers.” The school is accredited by the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS).

Update on Previously Reported Pending Applications

John Thomas College of Naturopathic Medicine
St. Charles, Missouri

This is a proposal to establish a new for-profit institution of higher education in order to provide naturopathic medical education programs. The proposal includes one first professional degree program, a Doctor of Naturopathic Medicine (NMD) degree, and a Pharmacology elective track. Enrollment in the proposed school would be limited to persons with “a professional health care degree and be license eligible or statutorily licensed to diagnose and treat the

human body.” Coursework would be delivered through classroom work (in a Friday evening through Sunday format), through distance education methods, and through supervised research. This school is not accredited.

Initial report to CBHE: June 2003

Current status: Department staff is continuing to work with school representatives to address concerns raised during the initial review of the application. In addition, school officials and department staff are reviewing information for the identification of a mutually agreeable external expert to provide a more detailed analysis of the programmatic and other aspects of the proposal.

Exemptions Granted

Eastern Missouri Law Enforcement Training Academy
St. Peters, Missouri

This training program, located on the campus of the St. Charles Community College, is designed “to develop police officer candidates morally, mentally, and physically and to instill within them the highest ideals of integrity, justice, courage, and commitment.” The school trains and places graduates as police officers in state, county, municipal and campus police agencies throughout the United States. The school and its curriculum are approved by the Missouri Department of Public Safety. Exemption was granted as “a school which is otherwise licensed or approved under and pursuant to any other licensing law of this state.”

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Appointments to the CBHE Proprietary School Advisory Committee
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

At the end of this calendar year, two vacancies will occur on the Proprietary School Advisory Committee (PSAC). The retiring members are Mr. Christopher Gearin, Hickey College (St. Louis) and Ms. Joan Meyer, National American University (Kansas City).

The Commissioner has appointed Ms. Kathleen Crawford and Mr. Gerald Terrebrood to fill those vacancies. These individuals have been selected through processes and criteria consistent with the board's June 7, 2001 policy to ensure diverse representation in appointments to committees. Their terms begin on January 1, 2004 and will expire on December 31, 2006.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.614, RSMo, Regulation of Proprietary Schools

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT(S)

- Attachment A: Background Information--Appointments to the Proprietary School Advisory Committee
- Attachment B: January 1, 2004 Membership Roster--CBHE Proprietary School Advisory Committee

Background Information
Appointments to the Proprietary School Advisory Committee

The Proprietary School Advisory Committee (PSAC) is a statutorily established committee consisting of seven members serving three-year terms. (Section 173.614, RSMo). The statute defines the general eligibility requirements as individual proprietors, general partners of a partnership, or managerial employees of proprietary schools. The statute also charges the committee with the following responsibilities.

- Advise the board in the administration of the proprietary school certification program
- Make recommendations with respect to the rules and regulations establishing minimum standards of operation
- Advise the board with respect to grievances and complaints

At the end of this calendar year, two vacancies will occur on the Proprietary School Advisory Committee (PSAC). The Commissioner has appointed Ms. Kathleen Crawford and Mr. Gerald Terrebrood to fill these vacancies. Their terms begin on January 1, 2004 and will expire on December 31, 2006.

Mr. Terrebrood is the President of Springfield College, located in Springfield, Missouri. Springfield College is operated by Corinthian Colleges, Inc. Corinthian Colleges, a publicly traded corporation, is one of the largest for-profit, postsecondary education companies in the United States and operates 79 schools in 21 states. The Springfield campus offers nondegree through bachelor's level programs in the areas of business and allied health. The institution is accredited by the Accrediting Council of Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS). Mr. Terrebrood has been the director of the Missouri campus since February of 2001. He has been involved in postsecondary school administration for more than 15 years as a school director and an academic officer. Mr. Terrebrood served in the United States Navy for more than 20 years, retiring in 1980. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Central Bible College and his Master of Arts degree in Biblical Literature from the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, both located in Springfield, Missouri.

Ms. Crawford is the founder, owner and director of the St. Charles School of Massage Therapy, located in St. Charles, Missouri. This school was established in 1997 and offers nondegree programs the massage therapy and related areas with the primary focus of preparing students for state licensure as massage therapists. The school is accredited by the Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation (COMTA), the United States Department of Education recognized accrediting commission for school's offering programs in this area of study. Ms. Crawford is a nationally certified massage therapist and bodywork professional. In addition to founding and operating the school, Ms. Crawford's experience includes having operated a spa and wellness center in St. Charles for more than 20 years and involvement with the state licensing board for massage therapists. Ms. Crawford has extensive specialized training in various aspects of massage therapy and alternative health therapies as well as course work at St. Louis area community colleges.

PROPRIETARY SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Membership Roster

January 1, 2004

Mr. Turner Brooks
Director of Student Financial Assistance
Vatterott College
10257 St. Charles Rock Road
St. Ann, MO 63074 (314) 427-1333
(Term expires 12/31/2004)

Ms. Kathleen Crawford
Director
St. Charles School of Massage Therapy
2440 Executive Drive, Suite 100
St. Charles, MO 63303 (636) 498-0777
(Term expires 12/31/2006)

Ms. Deborah Crow
Campus Director
Concorde Career Institute, Inc.
3239 Broadway
Kansas City, MO 64111 (816) 531-5223
(Term expires 12/31/2005)

Ms. Karen Finkenkeller
Director
ITT Technical Institute
13505 Lakefront Drive
Earth City, MO 63045-1416 (314) 298-7800
(Term expires 12/31/2005)

Mr. Brian Stewart
President
Bryan College
1700 South Campbell, Suite L
Springfield, MO 65807 (417) 862-5700
(Term expires 12/31/2005)

Mr. Gerald Terrebrood
President
Springfield College
1010 West Sunshine
Springfield, MO 65807 (417) 864-7220
(Term expires 12/31/2006)

Ms. Karen Watkins
Executive Director
TelTemps Training Resources, Inc.
5621 Delmar, Suite 109
St. Louis, MO 63112 (314) 367-1400
(Term expires 12/31/2004)

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Academic Program Actions
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
December 4, 2003

DESCRIPTION

All program actions that have occurred since the October 9, 2003 Coordinating Board meeting are reported in this information item.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Sections 173.005.2(1), 173.005.2(7), 173.030(1), and 173.030(2), RSMo, Statutory requirements regarding CBHE approval of new degree programs

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT

Academic Program Actions

ACADEMIC PROGRAM ACTIONS

I. Programs Discontinued

Southwest Missouri State University – West Plains

AAS, Paralegal Studies
C0, Agricultural – Farm Business Management
C0, Child Care Assistant
C0, Computer Software Applications, Introduction
C0, Office Administration I
C0, Office Administration II

University of Missouri – Columbia

MA, Health and Exercise Sciences, with an option in
Exercise and Sport Sciences

Ph.D., Health and Exercise Sciences

II. Programs and Options Placed on Inactive Status

III. New Programs Not Approved

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

IV. Approved Changes in Academic Programs

Ozarks Technical Community College

Current Programs:

AAS, Computer and Networks
AAS, Hospitality Management, with an option in
Travel and Tourism

Approved Changes: Title change of program and deletion of option

Programs as Changed:

AAS, Networking Technology
AAS, Hospitality Management

Southwest Missouri State University – West Plains

1. Current Program:

AAS, Industrial Technology, with four options in
Manufacturing Machine
Mechanical Drafting
Welding
Industrial Supervision

Approved Changes: Deletion of two options

Program as Changed:

AAS, Industrial Technology, with four options in
Mechanical Drafting
Industrial Supervision

2. Current Program:

ASN, Nursing (Delivered at Branson)

Approved Changes: Placing program on “Inactive” list

Program as Changed:

ASN, Nursing (Delivered at Branson) (Inactive)

University of Missouri – Columbia

1. Current Program:

MPA, Public Administration

Approved Changes: Graduate certificates developed from an approved degree program

Program as Changed:

MPA, Public Administration
GRCT, Public Management
GRCT, Organizational Change
GRCT, Nonprofit Management

2. Current Programs:

MED, EDSP, Career and Technical Education, with options in
Agricultural Education
Business & Marketing Education
Family & Consumer Sciences Education (Inactive)
Industrial Education (Inactive)
Vocational Technical Education

Ph.D., EDD, Career and Technical Education, with options in
Agricultural Education
Business & Marketing Education
Family & Consumer Sciences Education (Inactive)
Human Resources Education
Industrial Education (Inactive)
Vocational Technical Education

MA, Curriculum and Instruction, with options in
Art Education
Curriculum & Instruction, General
Early Childhood Education
Elementary Education
English Education
Foreign Language Education
Mathematics Education
Music Education
Reading Education
Science Education
Social Studies Education

MA, Special Education, with options in
Behavior Disorders
Curriculum Development for Exceptional Students
Early Childhood Special Education
Learning Disabilities
Mental Retardation
Special Education, General

EDSP, Curriculum and Instruction, with options in
Art Education
Curriculum & Instruction, General
Early Childhood Education
Educational Technology
Elementary Education
English Education
Foreign Language Education
Mathematics Education
Music Education
Reading Education
Science Education
Social Studies Education

EDD, Curriculum and Instruction, with options in
Art Education
Curriculum & Instruction, General

Early Childhood Education
Elementary Education
English Education
Foreign Language Education
Mathematics Education
Music Education
Reading Education
Science Education
Social Studies Education

EDD, Special Education, with options in
Administration and Supervision of Special Education
Behavior Disorders
Curriculum Development for Exceptional Students
Early Childhood Special Education
Learning Disabilities
Mental Retardation
Special Education, General

Approved Changes: Deletion of options

Programs as Changed:

MED, EDSP, Career and Technical Education, with options in
Business & Marketing Education
Vocational Technical Education

Ph.D., EDD, Career and Technical Education, with options in
Business & Marketing Education
Human Resources Education
Vocational Technical Education

MA, Curriculum and Instruction, with options in
Curriculum & Instruction, General
Music Education

MA, Special Education, with an option in
Special Education, General

EDSP, Curriculum and Instruction, with options in
Curriculum & Instruction, General
Mathematics Education
Music Education
Reading Education
Science Education

EDD, Curriculum and Instruction, with options in

Curriculum & Instruction, General
Elementary Education
Reading Education

EDD, Special Education, with options in
Administration and Supervision of Special Education
Special Education, General

University of Missouri – Kansas City

1. Current Program:
BSEE, Electrical Engineering

Approved Changes: Title change

Program as Changed:
BS, Electrical and Computer Engineering

2. Current Program:
BS, Biology, with option in
Cellular and Molecular Basis of Health

Approved Changes: Option added to existing approved degree program

Program as Changed:
BS, Biology, with options in
Cellular and Molecular Basis of Health
Bioinformatics

3. Current Program:
MS, Cellular and Molecular Biology, with options in
General
Biochemistry

Approved Changes: Option added to existing approved degree program

Program as Changed:
MS, Cellular and Molecular Biology, with options in
General
Biochemistry
Bioinformatics

4. Current Program:
BS, Computer Science, with options in
Software Engineering
Telecommunications Networking

Approved Changes: Option added to existing approved degree program

Program as Changed:

BS, Computer Science, with options in
Software Engineering
Telecommunications Networking
Bioinformatics

5. Current Program:

MS, Computer Science, with options in
Computer Networking
Software Engineering
Telecommunications Networking

Approved Changes: Option added to existing approved degree program

Program as Changed:

BS, Computer Science, with options in
Computer Networking
Software Engineering
Telecommunications Networking
Bioinformatics

6. Current Program:

BA, English, with options in
Journalism and Creative Writing
Secondary English Education

MA, English, with an option in
Professional Writing

Approved Changes: Changing title of options

Program as Changed:

BA, English, with options in
Creative Writing
Secondary English Education

MA, English, with an option in
Creative Writing

V. Received and Reviewed Changes in Programs (Independent Colleges and Universities)

Kansas City Art Institute

Current Program:

BFA, Bachelor of Fine Arts, with options in

Ceramics

Design

Fiber

Illustration

Painting

Photography

Printmaking

New Media

Sculpture

Received Change: Addition of option

Program as Changed:

BFA, Bachelor of Fine Arts, with options in

Ceramics

Design

Fiber

Illustration

Painting

Photography

Printmaking

New Media

Sculpture

Interdisciplinary Arts Studies

VI. Program Changes Requested and Not Approved

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

VII. Programs Withdrawn

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

VIII. New Programs Approved

Southwest Missouri State University – West Plains

AAS, General Agriculture

(Offered on-campus, at Mountain Grove campus, and via ITV methods)

IX. New Programs Received and Reviewed (Independent Colleges and Universities)

Lindenwood University

BA, Hospitality Services Management
(2+2 with St. Louis Community College at Forest Park)

Missouri Baptist University

MA, Christian Ministry
MBA, Business Administration
(Both are programs to be delivered on-campus and at Franklin County,
Troy-Wentzville, and Jefferson County sites)

Copyright © 2003
Board of Governors
Southwest Missouri
State University
Last Modified on
September 15, 2003

The **Missouri Campus Compact** is a statewide coalition of university and college presidents dedicated “to helping students develop the values and skills of civic participation through involvement in public service” (quotes are taken from the “Basic Tenets” of the national Campus Compact). Our State Compact currently has 30 members, with representatives from each of the categories of four-year public, four-year private, and two-year colleges and universities.

While the **Missouri Campus Compact** is the primary contact for Missouri institutions of higher education interested in civic engagement, there is a national organization, Campus Compact (<http://www.compact.org>), which currently has over 700 members. The focus of the national and state organizations, as well as the member institutions, however, is the same: to promote a vision for higher education “that supports not only the civic development of students, but the campus as citizen as well.” In short, the Compact seeks to achieve its goals primarily by providing resources to advance service-learning and civic engagement on campuses across the state.



Apply for the Raise Your Voice campaign Grant.
[Click here for more information!](#)